This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE CHURCH AND

LIBERTIES OF ENGLAND

THE

CHURCH AND LIBERTIES OF ENGLAND.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE VOICE OF THE PRAYER BOOK. A HANDBOOK FOR CHURCHMEN. 8vo. 1867. 4*s.* 6*d.* Popular Edition, 1872. 2*s.* 6*d.*

"One of the most valuable books of the kind that has emanated from the press in later times."—*Oxford University Herald.*

"Earnest and well-written volume."—*The Leader.*

"As a text-book this collection of lectures and annotations will be found very useful."—*Public Opinion.*

"The best book of its kind that we have met with. We cordially wish for the work a wide circulation and attentive perusal among all classes, ages, and orders in the Church."—*St. James's Chronicle.*

"The chapter on 'The Power of the Keys' alone gives a value to the work beyond that of any other book that we know of."—*Liverpool Courier.*

THE LORD'S PRAYER. LECTURES AND ANNOTATIONS. 8vo. 1860. 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE

CHURCH AND LIBERTIES

OF ENGLAND.

THE

TRUE CHARACTER AND PUBLIC DANGER OF THE PRESENT EXTREME MOVEMENT IN THE NATIONAL CHURCH;

WITH

DEDICATION AND APPENDICES.

BY

NEVISON LORAINE,

VICAR OF GROVE PARK WEST, LONDON; AUTHOR OF "THE VOICE OF THE PRAYER BOOK," ETC.

INTRODUCTION

BY THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF CHESTER.

"Γρηγορεῖτε στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει."

"Id esse verum quodcunque primum: id esse adulterum quodcunque posterius."

"Be calm in arguing: for fiercenesse makes errour a fault, and truth discourtesie."

LONDON:

SMITH, ELDER & Co., 15, WATERLOO PLACE.

1876.

[*All rights reserved.*]

LONDON:
PARDON AND SON, PRINTERS,
PATERNOSTER ROW.

DEDICATION.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

THE EARL OF HARROWBY, K.G., D.C.L.

My Lord,—

I have sincere gratification in being permitted to dedicate to you the following Lecture on "The Church and Liberties of England," etc. It has been delivered, and is now published with the intention of making more widely and determinately known the distinctive doctrines and practices of a remarkable school that has arisen in the National Church of England, within the last half century. I am unwilling to designate this school by any epithet upon which an offensive construction could be placed; but I am guilty neither of injustice nor discourtesy in saying that it is eagerly endeavouring to disturb the foundations of the national faith, to

re-introduce principles and practices unknown to the primitive ages of the Church, and to undo that great work which was achieved, in the interests alike of the religious and civil life of the nation, by the heroic conflict of the English Reformation. This "distinctly counter-Reformation movement" * is now diligently at work within the National Church; and it is my solemn conviction that, in respect of its character and operations, English Churchmen and the English people generally should be put in possession of definite and trustworthy information. High interests are involved both for Church and State. Let that sacerdotal supremacy be re-established, which is involved in the doctrines of auricular confession, judicial absolution, and the transubstantiation of the elements in the Holy Communion, and a revolution will be accomplished in the entire system of the religious thought and life of this realm. But the indisputable aim of the ultra-Ritualist party is to re-leaven the English Church with these and kindred distinctively Romish principles; † and, unhappily, too generally there is extended to the action of this bold and zealous party the immunity granted to apparently Quixotic enterprises. But history abounds with examples of the achievement of the impossible. Vast

* Bishop Ellicott. *Vide* Appendices A. B. and C.

† *Vide* Lord Coleridge's opinion, Appendix C.

results may be often traced to seemingly insignificant causes.

True it may lie beyond the immediate range of party-power to pervert a nation, yet it may come within the scope of party activity to overthrow a church. Let a conviction possess the English people that the National Communion is betraying the sacred trust of the Reformed faith, and her days, as the Established Church of the nation, are numbered. But the disestablishment of the English Church would introduce an era in the national life, charged with momentous issues.

The severance of that time-honoured alliance would shake the pillars of the State, and imperil privileges of the national life dearly bought and highly prized. Nor do I agree with those who imagine that in such a catastrophe the State would be the sole sufferer. I foresee and acknowledge that the Church would also feel the grievous effects of that disaster. Bonds of ancient union would be broken. Parties would become sects, rents would increase in the seamless robe, further schisms in the body of Christ. And Papal Rome remembers well the famous motto of Pagan Rome, *Divide et impera.* Following in the steps of his far-sighted predecessor, Cardinal Manning urges, and it is his unhappy fortune that, in respect of this question, his memory encourages

his hopes, that the *regina viarum* for Roman aggression in England lies through the National Church. It has been the oft-repeated aspiration of the leaders of Romanism in England, "Give us the command of the ancient and formidable fortifications of the National Church, and the conquest of the kingdom is then but a war of detail." But it would be a hazardous and, I fear, a fatal experiment, only possible if prejudice should usurp the seat of prudence, to entrust the guardianship of the citadel of our Reformed faith to such divided forces. Earnestness and enthusiasm without order and cohesion, are but ill-considered expedients with which to meet the highly-organized, disciplined, and compact legions of Vatican ambition. I am not unmindful that it may be urged, "But there is division in the National Church." I venture, however, to affirm that all the different schools of loyal thought, which find place within the generous freedom of the Anglican communion, are true to the principles distinctively reasserted in the sixteenth century. From "High" Churchmen as well as "Low," have proceeded those learned and powerful treatises in opposition to the Roman schism, that are among the glories of Anglican literature. Men of the school of Hooker, Andrews, Cosin, Bull, South, and Philpotts, as truly as that of Jewel, Chillingworth, Tillotson, Romaine, Simeon,

and Sumner, have devoted some of the best efforts of their genius to give grace and strength to the bulwarks of the Reformation.

We confess with sorrow and regret the present, I had almost said the momentary, existence of "a counter-Reformation movement." The ultra-Ritualists, however, are scarcely entitled, save by courtesy, to be designated an English Church party. They lack, without alluding to other disqualifications, that agreement in doctrinal principles, and consequent cohesion, which are the *sine quâ non* of party life. The direction in which they move may be one, but their paths are various. I acknowledge, however, that in recent years attempts to discipline the forces have been traceable; and whilst the impetuous energy that marks men of the most advanced type has remained unchecked, there have been at work efforts after the organization necessary for combined effort. I confess, too, nay I urge the dangerous character belonging to their hitherto even desultory warfare. My contention is, however, that the existence of such a movement in the Church of England is no just reason for an attack on the Church, but rather for the correction or ejection of those by whom the movement is guided and the Church imperilled.

The recent appearance of "excrescences," "parasitical growths," "fungi,"* on the time-honoured tree, beneath whose grateful shadows have rested generations past, may urge the need to dig about and dress it, but not to cut it down. And that cry of "rase it, rase it, even to the ground!" is a peculiarly dangerous one, either in Church or State. The passions of an impetuous hour may cast down the structure to which centuries have given their labour and their love; but once overthrown, a nation's wit and wealth combined can never re-erect the fallen fabric.†

Free the Church of England from whatever may enfeeble her constitution or impair her fruitfulness! Let her arise and put on her beautiful garments, for the varied resources of her power were never more needed than at the present moment. Her extensive learning is requisite to meet the modern aspects of sceptical thought; her reformed Catholicity is necessary to resist the present eager aggression of Vaticanism; her parochial system, adapted year by year to the changing circumstances of our population, is the only method by which can be carried into the homes of the masses the light, the comfort, and the laws of the Christian life. And never has the Church of England been moved

* Canon Liddon, *vide* Capel-Liddon correspondence, *Times*, Jan. 1875.

† *Vide* Appendices D. E. and F.

with deeper activities than now, or more alive to the great mission committed to her in respect of the moral and spiritual needs of the English people.

This, therefore, is not the time to alter her constitution, nor to sever her ancient alliance. But it is emphatically the time to purge her from Romish enfeeblement, to succour and strengthen her in the defence of that Reformed faith which, respecting the honest convictions of all men, is the congenial home of religious and civil freedom. In order, however, to uphold the hands and stimulate the efforts of those to whom, in the first instance, it is given to deal with the present exigency, public opinion must be matured by distinct and trustworthy information, and the following lecture has been offered as a small contribution to that end.

To you, my Lord, are well known the present danger and the present need. Recently, at a meeting of the committee of "The English Reformation Defence Society," your Lordship urged that some method should be promptly adopted for circulating information respecting the present aspect of ultra-Ritualist thought and practice, since they are the allies of Roman aggression, and my honoured friend, the Dean of Chester, proposed that I should give some lectures, free from the tone of party hostility, but displaying decisively, and, as far as possible, in its own language, the mind and method of the extreme movement in the Church.

Hence originated the manual that I have now the honour of dedicating to your Lordship. And, indeed, the necessity for the circulation of fuller information on this "burning question" has been acknowledged, and even urged, in very varied quarters. In the Ritual debate in the Convocation of Canterbury on the 2nd July in last year, Canon Gregory argued that "the present was a most suitable time for the enlightenment of the public mind on the actual position of the Established Church." And Prebendary Joyce, sustaining his amendment to Canon Gregory's motion, "pledged the house to an opinion that it was not advisable to go to Parliament at present, because there was not sufficient information among the members to enable them to discuss the matter with advantage." But on all sides there are evidences of the need of precise and authoritative information as to ultra-Ritualist tenets and intentions. My aim in the following lecture is not therefore an elaborate argument against the ultra-Ritualist position. This can only be satisfactorily done by treatises which deal separately and completely with distinctive doctrines or practices of that school, as in the masterly work on "Confession" by the late lamented Mr. Jelf, himself a High Churchman; or in the unanswerable volume, "Before the Table," by the Dean of Chester, on the *vexata quæstio* of "the *celebrant's* position." I have simply striven to state firmly and

fairly, and with some degree of order, the views and customs of the "counter-Reformationists," as represented by themselves. Their opinions are sometimes conflicting, and their methods antagonistic; but that is *their* fault, not mine. My difficulty has been to compress within reasonable limits a subject covering so large an area, and to present quotations sufficiently brief and definite for the present purpose. Unhappily, the evidences are only too numerous of the alienation of ultra-Ritualists from the ancient faith and accustomed methods of the Reformed Church of England.

I trust that I have not, either in the manner or spirit of my observations, forgotten what is due in dealing with so grave a question; but fraught as it is with consequences both deep and wide, I regret sincerely that my skill has not been more worthy the occasion. For it was a just sentiment of the renowned Bishop of Poitiers, "*Etiam quæ pro religione dicimus cum grandi metu et disciplinâ dicere debemus.*"

I am, my Lord,

Yours most faithfully,

NEVISON LORAINE.

THE VICARAGE, GROVE PARK WEST.

THE CONVERSION OF S. PAUL, 1876.

INTRODUCTION.

I HAVE been asked to write a short Introduction to this Lecture: and I very gladly do this: for it seems to me to be an admirable manual of most useful instruction on a serious subject at a very anxious time.

Most thoughtful persons who care about the fate of the Church of England are conscious that it is threatened at present by a serious danger: but in many cases this apprehension is very vague; and what is wanted in several quarters is definite knowledge of this danger. Some have no opportunity of informing themselves on the subject: some, who yet are not indifferent, do not take the trouble to inquire: some allow their uneasiness to be set at rest by specious explanations. Hence a small book, which furnishes in a convenient form carefully-collected facts bearing on this question, is likely to be very useful.

There is, indeed, in some minds, an impression that the trouble with which we have to deal is made up

of mere trivialities and follies in the matter of public worship. Even if this were a correct impression, we should still have a grave subject before us. It is not at all certain that trivialities and follies in public worship will easily die a natural death. Anything by which men persuade themselves that they are religious obtains a very strong hold upon the worldly mind. Moreover, it is no light evil if the simplicity and solemnity of our English worship becomes overloaded with technicalities or degenerates into display. The great work of saving souls will not thus be promoted. A religion in which externals occupy the chief attention is certainly not the religion of the New Testament. But, in fact, our real danger lies much deeper: a very earnest and determined spirit is in many instances at work under this outward show: and this is proved and well illustrated in Mr. Loraine's Lecture.

Others think that the peril with which we have to do is not widely spread within the Church. Admitting the existence of a knot of extreme men, who desire to transform both the general tone of religious thought, and also the customary religious ceremonies of our Church, still they urge that we have not to dread any large organized party, consistently pervaded and guided by this intention. All this may be very readily conceded; and it is shown in this Lecture that there is considerable variety of sentiment among those who,

on the whole, are moving in one direction. Still the proofs are abundant, that we are in the presence of a well-considered policy and of very persevering efforts: we perceive everywhere the indications, if not of a large and thoroughly-compacted party, yet of a wide-spread tendency, urged on by a strong motive power, with great sagacity in points of detail: and especially we see that the matter is so managed as to secure the adhesion of many who only partially agree with those who are prepared to go all lengths.*

Here it is that we touch what appears to me our greatest danger. The general body of our Moderate High-Churchmen allow themselves to be silent just when the Church of England expects them to speak. They complain in private, but take no action in public. Partly alarmed by threats of secession, partly following mere preferences of taste, they suffer themselves to be overpowered; they fall into the ranks behind and swell the numbers of the advancing party, to which their names are of infinite value, and thus give to it a momentum which without them it could not have. But it is not a high ambition in those who, as is remarked in the following pages, have a great his-

* To give a single illustration, the concession of what is called the Eastward position in consecrating at the Eucharist is pleaded for by some because it has no doctrinal meaning, while it is contended for by others because of its high doctrinal teaching. Thus, if it is gained on the former plea, it is ready to be used for the latter, which is contradictory of the former.

torical name, thus to be made the wooden handle of a spear, the point of which, though it may be small, is sharp, and is used to inflict a most dangerous wound.

But, again, there is a danger to us in the appearance of mere partisan opposition, and of indiscriminate prejudice, on the other side. How far there is such a degree of partisanship and prejudice as to justify a sweeping accusation may well be doubted: but at least there is some appearance of these things; and this is quite enough to give a great opportunity to those who are not scrupulous in the use of means to compass their ends. Arguments which it is not convenient to answer can often be set aside with considerable effect, if those who employ them can be brought under the general formula of Puritanical opposition to Catholic Truth.

Hence there is a peculiar value, at this crisis, in the utterances of men who oppose the errors of the time without themselves belonging to any party; and this I can say confidently, after long acquaintance, of Mr. Loraine, that, though he has attained to strong convictions on the subject here handled, he is quite independent of any party-connection; while it will be evident to those who study his pages that he has made himself thoroughly acquainted with those devotional books of a certain character, the circulation of which is doing much mischief amongst us, and which have formed the chief materials of his Lecture.

Here I beg leave to make a remark, which I think is worthy of some consideration, regarding devotional books. The lecturer has brought, in this volume, the contents of some such books to view, which will shock those who have not encountered such teaching before within the limits of the Church of England. But I am inclined to think that some of the less startling books of the same general character are still more harmful. Just as moderate men may be more dangerous than extreme ones, if the moderation of the former is used to shelter and foster the excesses of the latter, so books of devotion, the general contents of which are thoroughly English, may, for that very reason, be full of risk to those who use them, if they contain the germs of that which, when full grown, is not English but Roman. It may, perhaps, be permitted me to repeat here what I have written elsewhere: "I am disposed to think that the greatest danger lurks in some of those books which at first sight deviate least from our common standards; as, for instance, when the instructions concerning Confession are printed from the book of 1549, along with those which finally superseded them in 1662; or when suggestions of Sacrificial Presentation in the Communion are interpolated among those prayers and rubrics of our authorized manual which contain nothing of the kind."

But, without obtruding on the reader any further

remarks of my own, I will cordially recommend Mr. Loraine's treatise to very careful consideration. I hope it may tend to dislodge some loyal High-Churchmen from the false position which they now occupy,* that it may disperse some mists and open some intelligent eyes to see the position in which we stand, and that it may stimulate some of the laity to take public action against the dangers that threaten our social and religious life. It cannot be safe to trifle with Ultra-Sacerdotalism, in either its sacrificial or its judicial aspect. If the Holy Communion is transformed into a priestly act done vicariously on behalf of the people, and if the consciences of the members of our families are brought under the scrutiny and dominion of those who claim powers hitherto repudiated, the work of the English Reformation is undone.

J. S. HOWSON.

The Deanery, Chester,
Sexagesima, 1876.

* The weighty and dignified words of the Bishop of London on this subject, near the close of his recent Charge, are printed in the Appendix.

"We make the plain appeal to the Anglican Churchmen who are still sound at heart, whether, through mistaken kindness, or from motives which may seem to them worthier and more urgent, they will give their sanction to those Romanizing practices to which the whole traditions of their party are opposed, and of which they themselves in reality disapprove. Some plain mark of their decision at the present crisis, even their mere abstinence from the show of sanction to the innovating party, might effect a grand example of one of those mighty moral forces which often turn the tide of human affairs."—*Quarterly Review*, April, 1876. Art. "Church Innovations."

CONTENTS.

THE Church of England, its Intimate Alliance with the Historic Life of England—The Condition of the National Church a Question of National Interest (Gladstone)—Present Hopeful Activity (Döllinger)—Ultra-Ritualist Movement: Opinions of Episcopal Bench, Senate Press—Ritualism Distinct from "High Church"—What is Ritualism? What Does it Teach? Whither Does it Tend?—Unwonted Customs and Costumes: their Doctrinal Significance—High Celebration—Doctrine of the Priesthood—The Eucharist a Mass—Corporal Presence—Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation, which?—At One with Rome—Fasting Communion—Adoration of the Elements—A Re-offered Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead—Ritualist Punctilios, Auricular Confession and Judicial Absolution, "the One Way"—A Secret Book: Instructions for Anglican Confessors—Three Centuries Without a Confessional—Cultus of the B. V. Mary: Mediatrix, Saints Co-intercessors—A Roman Monsignor almost "Taken In"—"Seven Sacraments"—Monastic and Conventual Life—Masses for the Dead—Reservation of the Eucharist—Processions and Veneration of Relics—Celibacy—The Church above the Bible—What says B. C. B.?—Zeal not according to Knowledge—Zizania—The Reformation a Disaster—"Protestantism a Cancer needing Fire and Steel"—Ritualism Confessedly an Organization to Romanize the Church of England—A Ritualistic Anathema—What is Anglican "Protestantism"?—Critical Times—The Romeward Exodus—Statesmen Alarmed—"Shooting Niagara"—Church and Realm both in Danger—Aims of Cardinal Manning—English Church "Stops the Way": Her Fidelity the Hope of England—What I Saw on the Pyrenees.

APPENDICES.

A. Bishop of London on "Our Present Difficulties."

B. Bishop of Gloucester on "Ultimate Aims of Ritualism."

C. Lord Coleridge on "The Hidden Principle of Ritualism."

D. A Nonconformist defends the Established Church.

E. The Duke of Argyll and Bishop of Bath and Wells on "Ritualism a Peril to the Establishment."

F. Active Generosity of the National Church. *Times* and *Pall Mall Gazette* quoted.

G. Mr. Beresford Hope and *The Literary Churchman* on "The Leakage Towards Rome."

H. Bishop of Winchester on "The Historic Continuity of the English Church."

I. Romish and Ritualist Doctrine of "Intention."

THE

CHURCH AND LIBERTIES OF ENGLAND.

THE Church of England is the common heritage of the people of England. A primitive Episcopal communion, it was planted in Britain in the earliest centuries of the Christian era, and onward from those dim and far-off years, through all the sufferings, struggles, and triumphs of our nation's advancing story, the life of the English Church has been an inherent, historic part of the life of the English nation. "Take the Church of England out "of the history of England," said one of the greatest of living statesmen, "and the history of England becomes "a chaos, without order, without life, and without "meaning."* Interwrought, therefore, with the very tissue and fibre of the nation's historic and constitutional life, the national Church is a national possession, dear to the English people. And hence the sound condition and healthy action of this ancient and powerful communion, whilst they command the filial devotion

* The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, Speech in House of Commons, May 16th, 1873. *Vide* also Appendix H.

5-2

of Churchmen, involve also popular privileges, and some of the most sacred interests of the commonwealth.

What, then, is the state of the English Church at the present time? Let us hear the testimony of a most accomplished and independent witness. The illustrious chief of the Old Catholic movement, Dr. Döllinger, writes: "It may still be said with truth that no "Church is so national, so deeply rooted in popular "affection, so bound up with the institutions and man- "ners of the country, or so powerful in its influence on "national character. During the last forty years it has "extended its range, besides strengthening itself inter- "nally, by the foundation of numerous colonial bishop- "rics in all parts of the globe. It possesses a rich theo- "logical literature, inferior only to the German in "extent and depth, and an excellent translation of the "Bible, a masterpiece of style, and more accurate than "the Lutheran. . . . But what I should estimate "most highly is the fact that the cold, dull indiffer- "entism, which, on the Continent has spread like a "deadly mildew over all degrees of society, has no place "in the British Isles. To whatever extent scepticism "may have advanced among the younger generation, "on the whole, the Englishman takes an active part in "Church interests and questions, and that unnatural "hostility and division between laity and clergy pro- "duced by Ultramontanism in Catholic countries is quite "unknown there. . . . What has been accomplished "during the last thirty years by the energy and gene- "rosity of religious Englishmen, set in motion and "guided by the Church, in the way of popular educa-

"tion and Church building, far exceeds what has been "done in any other country."* And he proceeds to speak of the general respect for public worship in England, and the dignity and thoroughness with which religious questions of the day are discussed in the assemblies of the Church.

And Dr. Döllinger's judgment is sustained by facts. During this century some 10,000 churches have been built or restored, at a cost of nearly £20,000,000. In 1831 there were 10,000 benefices, now there are between 13,000 and 14,000. Forty years ago there were under 6,000 parsonages, there are now over 11,000, with a clear gain of over 5,000 resident clergy. In thirty-five years the Church of England has spent over three and a half millions sterling in the erection of schools. These are some of the evidences of unrivalled vigour in the national Church.† But in this season of hopeful activity, a movement has crept into life, and grown both bold and busy, exciting general anger and distrust, and awakening, I believe, among all sound and sober-minded Churchmen a deep and sad regret.

It is in respect of this movement that I am to address you; I trust in no spirit of angry declamation, or controversial bitterness. For Church controversy I have no relish; but exceptional circumstances demand exceptional methods. Crises make their own conditions of action. And without being in one whit an alarmist, with full confidence in the soundly Scriptural character of the English Church, of its abiding place in the

* Quoted by Mr. Gladstone, House of Commons, May 16th, 1873.

† *Vide Quarterly Review*, July, 1874. *Vide* also Appendix F.

national constitution and the national heart, as the Mother Church of the English people, I do yet believe her present circumstances to be critical, demanding from those who love her a judgment enlightened, calm, and firm; and, in respect of the questions that at present agitate and imperil her, fearless speech and decisive action, attempered by a spirit of Christian charity.

But do I overrate either the publicity, the proportion, or the mischievous character of the movement to which I allude, and thus misinterpret the present exigency? I think not. The Primate of England, addressing an assembly of archdeacons and rural deans in October, 1871, said: "No one can take up a newspaper or novel "in a railway carriage without being confronted with "the fact that the laity of England are alarmed by "seeing that there are some of the clergy who are bent "on restoring the Mass, and the distinctively Roman "doctrines which this country rejected at the Reforma-"tion." The Archbishop of York characterizes the action of the extreme Ritualist section as "a deliberate "intention to alter the doctrinal position of the Church "of England."* And the energetic language of the late lamented Bishop Wilberforce† was: "I hate and "abhor the attempt to Romanize the English Church."

Every bishop on the Episcopal Bench has, I believe, expressed a similar judgment. And these terms of anxious and regretful reprobation are no merely recent or temporary ebullition. In 1857 the two Archbishops and twenty-two Bishops issued conjointly an address

* Reply to Deputation, 1866. † House of Lords, July, 1873.

expressive of the profound anxiety with which they viewed "the troubles, suspicions, and discontents" occasioned by unwonted Ritual observances, and their aggressively "dangerous character." And now, again, after a lapse of nearly a quarter of a century, we find the whole of the Episcopal Bench, with two exceptions, joining in an allocution in which, amid words of thankfulness for Church progress, and of earnest remonstrance with those who refuse to obey the lawful authority of the Church, they say:

"We also observe with increasing anxiety and alarm "the dissemination of doctrines and encouragement of "practices repugnant to the teaching of Holy Scrip- "ture and to the principles of the Church, as derived "from Apostolic times and as authoritatively set forth "at the Reformation. More especially we call serious "attention to the multiplication and the assiduous "circulation among the young and susceptible of "manuals of doctrine and private devotion, of which "it is not too much to say that many of the doctrines "and practices they inculcate are wholly incompatible "with the teaching and principles of our Reformed "Church."

And not only has the Bench of Bishops spoken with marked unanimity, and reiterated condemnation of the teachings and tendencies of the Ritualist school, but from the *Times* down to the humblest provincial journal, and from the *Quarterly* through the whole range of serial publications, the entire public press of England has occupied itself with this extreme Ritualist movement; and, recognizing it as the ally and auxiliary of that

Roman Communion which is the historic foe of civil and religious freedom, they have urgently condemned it as disloyalty to the genius and constitution of the English Church, and a source of mischief and danger to the rights and privileges of the English people.

The House of Commons, too, with a unanimity, energy, and decisiveness that have never been exceeded in its history, passed a Bill, as the distinguished First Lord of the Treasury said, "to put down Ritualism," and, he added, "I mean by Ritualism the practice of "a certain portion of the clergy of the Church of Eng- "land of ceremonies which they themselves confess are "symbolical of doctrine which they are pledged, by "every solemn compact which can bind men to their "sovereign and their country, to renounce and repu- "diate."* But the Episcopal Bench, the Senate, and the press of England are not wont to speak with such emphasis unless the occasion be grave and urgent; and it cannot be consistent with the duty of English Churchmen or English citizens to be indifferent when there resounds through the country such a chorus of anxious expostulation.

I ask you, therefore, carefully to consider with me, *What is Ritualism? What does it teach? Whither does it tend?* In the use of the term *Ritualism*, permit me to disclaim any covert reproach. I employ it simply to indicate, not to characterize, that small, energetic, well-known, though new-born party, of which it is the familiar designation—a party totally distinct, remember, from that great and long-distinguished school of

* Speech in House of Commons.

thought, designated High Church. This distinction, which I am anxious to mark, has been carefully drawn by the Prime Minister of England,* and the loyalty of the High Church party as frankly admitted by the President of the Church Association.†

I speak from no party point of view, with no desire to divide English Churchmen, but longing, rather, to combine all schools of loyal thought in one compact resistance to disloyalty and disobedience. I rejoice in the comprehensiveness and liberality of thought that mark the National Church; but I solemnly believe that the Ritualist school have daringly transgressed the utmost bounds of her lawful liberty; that they are tampering with the foundations of her security, and are thereby putting in jeopardy some of the most sacred rights and privileges of this State and nation.

A vague impression to this effect is current in the popular mind; but the facts on which alone a trustworthy estimate can be formed are not generally known, in their naked reality, even among Churchmen. It is my undisguised and honest purpose to make them known. My object is not by argument or declamation to urge my own views of this school, but, by unveiling

* "Of all the false pretences of this body of men [the Ritualists] there is, in my opinion, none more glaring and pernicious than their pretending that they are a portion of the High Church party of England" (Speech in House of Commons, August 5th, 1874).

† "There is, in fact, a broad distinction between the High Churchmen and the Ritualist party. The High Churchmen are within the pale of the Church of England. That Church in her comprehensiveness includes High Churchmen, while she excludes the Ritualists" (Speech of J. R. Andrews, Esq., Chairman of the Church Association Conference, Wolverhampton, November 27th, 1873). *Vide* also Appendix A.

its mind and method, to reveal to you what it really is, and to discover to those who are gliding under the spell of its fascination whitherward it leads.*

Ritualism shall speak for itself in its own words. Even the *Church Times* has been good enough to say, "There can, of course, be no objection to this." We shall see. I believe Ritualism revealed will be its own defeat. But if it is a movement to bring to light some "forgotten lore" of the English Church, or to reach deeper springs of spiritual vigour for the well-being of the people and the glory of God, I say, let it progress and prevail. On the other hand, if it is undermining the ancient and Scriptural foundations of our religious belief, and so sapping the strongholds of the nation's strength, then I urge decisive action that the plague may be stayed. The verdict I leave to the Church and people of England.

Ritualism arrests public attention by its introduction of customs and costumes totally unfamiliar. It has disturbed the rich but sober order of our Anglican ritual with spectacular effects and histrionic performances; and to the chaste and simple vestments of the clergy it has added an entire wardrobe of curious and

* "In the religion of the Reformed English Church the conservation of authority is a first principle, and the restoration of freedom and of the respect due to the individual conscience is another; and if there be anything, claiming the name and dignity of a first principle, which it has been specifically and more than others given to the Church of England to uphold, it has been the maintenance in their just combination of these two great vital forces, and the endeavour to draw from their contact a harmonious result" (*Church Quarterly Review*, No. I., "Italy and her Church," p. 2, by Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone).

decorative apparel, the very names of which were unknown to English Churchmen.

But these we are told, by an ingenious and daring apologist of the most advanced school, are to satisfy the cravings "of persons of refined, artistic, and imaginative "tastes and faculties," to please "women" and "children," to interest "working men," and, in short, to be generally attractions and "stimuli;" and the same writer, "appealing to the theatrical world, says, "managers "have been constantly compelled to make gorgeous "spectacles their main attraction, and a splendid trans-"formation scene, or a telling stage procession, will draw "crowds night after night. . . . Hence a lesson "may be learnt by all who are not too proud to learn "from the stage. For it is an axiom in liturgiology "that no public worship is really deserving of its name, "unless it be histrionic." And since "elaborate pro-"cessions with badges, music, and banners, are found "needful appliances for attracting members and keep-"ing them together" amid "the Odd Fellows and the "Foresters;" and in the "gin palace," "painting, "light, and music are found necessary adjuncts," we are told "it is the merest besotted folly" not to use these spectacular effects and histrionic arts in the house of God and in the sacred services of religion.*

But if this was all that was signified by a pompous ritual and gorgeous decorative art, even though learnt from the gin palace and the stage, however we might question the taste or dispute their religious utility, their

* *Vide* "The Church and the World," Art. "Missionary Aspect of Ritualism."

employment need not arouse any wide-spread opposition; but the writer in the essays already quoted, confesses that "Ritualism is the object lesson of religion." It has, therefore, dogmatic significance. Its end is the engrafting of doctrine. The "Directorium Anglicanum" (xv.) says: "Ritualism is a science as well as a theology." "The science of ritual and ceremonial has a theological "and sacramental function" (xvi.). Another volume, which gives directions for ornaments, processions, high celebrations, low celebrations, mortuary celebrations, &c., "The Ritual Reason Why,"* opens as follows:—

1. "*What is Ritual?* It is the employment of Sym- "bols in Divine Worship according to a recognized "or traditional system."

2. "*To what end are Symbols thus employed?* Partly "to uphold the dignity of divine worship, and partly to "shadow forth by outward deed and gesture certain "truths which might otherwise be lost sight of."

A layman of the diocese of London† says: "If Ritual- "ism be not an outward shrine of doctrine, it is foolish "and absurd, we openly acknowledge it."

Processions, banners, lights, incense, attitude of the priest, service of acolyte and thurifer, with all the paraphernalia of Ritualist use, amice, alb, chasuble, cope, corporal, ciborium, chrismatory, maniple, monstrance, pyx, purificator, navicula, and the rest of this strange catalogue of effects, requiring a glossary to explain their use and meaning, are not merely the items of a spectacular ecclesiastical eccentricity; they are the

* London, Hayes, 1868.

† "Doctrine and Ritual," Palmer, 1866.

"object lesson of religion;" symbols of theological thought; an "outward shrine of doctrine." The question involved, then, in the introduction of this unfamiliar ritual is a grave one, not to be estimated indifferently as a mere matter of a little more or less of ceremony. It is confessedly a school of doctrine. But the Apostolic admonition was "Take heed to thyself and to the doctrine." Neither the individual Christian nor the corporate Church can afford to treat with any other than devout seriousness the question of doctrinal belief. The Creed is the foundation of the Church. Convictions are the matrix of character. "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he." Therefore the Master said, "Beware of the leaven," for the leaven is subtle, progressive, assimilative in its operations, and that leaven is doctrine.

What then are the DOCTRINES *to which Ritualism gives expression and currency?*

Let us enter a Ritualist Church at what is called a *High Celebration.* The eye centres at once on the chancel, with its spectacular appointments, vested Priest, and histrionic performance; and you find there the kernel of the whole system of Ritualist doctrinal speciality.

But what do the treatises, manuals, catechisms, and books of instruction belonging to this school teach respecting this central function?

They teach the exalted dignity and mystical power of the clergy as a sacrificing priesthood.

In "Tracts for the Day," edited by the Rev. Orby

Shipley,* No. 5, "The Real Presence," we read: ". . There can be no valid Eucharist without an "ordained Priest, because it is a Sacrifice and an ex- "tension to the Church on earth of the Priesthood "which Christ is ever exercising in the heavenly "tabernacle. Priesthood and Sacrifice are correlative "terms. Whenever there is a Sacrifice there must be "a Priest to offer it; and 'every Priest,' as St. Paul "testifies, 'is ordained to offer Gifts and Sacrifices.' "In order, therefore, to bring the Eucharistic Sacrifice "into connection with that which the Great High "Priest is offering above, there must be the inter- "position of one commissioned by Him to perform "that high function. When our Lord instituted the "Sacrifice, He ordained the Priesthood at the same "time."

In the same volume, another essay, No. 1, "Priestly Absolution," p. 25, states: "The Christian Priest- "hood sums up the offices which under the old cove- "nants were distributed. The Priest was the sacri- "ficing, the Prophet the preaching, and the Judge the "ruling, officer. The Catholic Priest at the altar offers "the adorable sacrifice, of which the bloody holocausts "under the law were but shadows; in the pulpit he "declares the oracles of God; and in the confessional "he sits in his judicial capacity."

In the "Catechism of Theology:" † "The Priest "entering the chancel with his attendants reminds "us of our Saviour going up to Jerusalem to "offer Himself upon the altar of the cross." "The

* London, Longmans, 1868. † London, Masters, 1873.

"Priest incenses the altar, the acolytes incense the "Priest, and the incense may be understood to repre- "sent the merits of it."

"The Ministry of Consolation"* teaches, concerning the position held by the Priest, that "His office and "the reverence due to him depend entirely on that "cardinal doctrine of the earthly Priesthood, as the "divinely-appointed channel through which the Om- "nipotent power of the sinless High Priest in heaven "is conveyed by the ordinances of the Church, and "through them applied to the souls of His members."

But the statement advances. In "Froude's Remains," we read: "The power of making the Body "and Blood of Christ is vested in the successors of the "apostles" (vol. i. p. 26).

Further, "The Catechism of Theology" asserts: "The Priest at the altar is virtually Christ Himself" (p. 58).

The Ritualist contention is, then, no Sacrament, no Religion; no Priest, no Sacrament; *ergo*, no Priest, no Religion. For, indeed, the Priest in his office is "virtually Christ Himself."†

From this doctrine of the priesthood we are conducted by Ritualist teachers to that of *The real objective presence of Christ's Body and Blood, Soul and Godhead on*

* London, Masters, 1867. 2nd ed., cap. iii.

† "The Catholic faith is a Religion of Sacraments. . . . Not a single step can be taken in the supernatural life without the co-operation of Sacraments. . . No Sacramental grace, can be applied to individual souls without the intervention of a personal agency" (*vide* "Sermons on Sin," Rev. Orby Shipley, Rivingtons, 1868, Sermon iii.).

*the altar, as a constantly repeated Sacrifice for the living and the dead.**

"Devotions for Mass" says: "So soon as the Priest "has said the prayer of consecration, the God-man "Christ Jesus is really, truly, and indeed there. . . . "Jesus is on the altar, as truly and really as He was "upon the Cross, or in the manger of Bethlehem. "Jesus is on the altar, as truly and as really as He is "enthroned in heaven" (p. 18).

"The Little Prayer Book,"† intended chiefly for Beginners in Devotion; Revised and Corrected by Three Priests, says: "At the words, THIS IS MY BODY, "THIS IS MY BLOOD; you must believe that the bread "and wine become the Real Body and Blood with the "Soul and Godhead of JESUS CHRIST; bow down "your heart and body in deepest adoration when the "Priest says these Awful Words, and worship your "Saviour then verily and indeed present on His "altar: then say, Hail, True Body! born of Mary "spotless virgin's virgin birth," &c.

"Act of Faith: I most firmly believe, O Jesus, "that in this Holy Sacrament Thou art present verily "and indeed, that here is Thy Body and Blood, Thy "Soul and Thy Godhead; all this I confess that I "receive when I receive the Holy Communion with "my mouth." Mark! "All this I receive with *my* "*mouth.*"

"The Companion to the Book of Common Prayer"‡ says: "We must, therefore, believe that the body which

* *Vide* as to "repeated sacrifice" quotations pp. 22, 23.

† London, Palmer. 9th thousand. 1872. ‡ London, Palmer. 1864.

"was born of the Blessed Virgin, which suffered upon "the cross, ascended into heaven, and now sitteth at the "right hand of God, is really, truly, substantially, and "locally present with the consecrated elements without "those elements being changed."

"Tracts for the Day," No. 5, "The Real Presence:" "By the Real Presence of Christ is not meant a pre- "sence by divine power, or spiritual grace, but the "presence of His very true Body; not anything dif- "ferent from the body which He had on earth, and "which He took up into heaven—not anything to "which the name or properties of His body are merely "ascribed in a Sacramental sense; but that very body "which He took of the substance of the Virgin Mary, "His mother, which was 'crucified, dead, and buried,' "and ascended far above all heavens. . . He is pre- "sent *really*, not to the faith which ascends up to "heaven to lay hold of Him as some speak, but ob- "jectively in the Sacrament. He is present *substantially*, "not by any grace or virtue emanating from His "Sacred Body, or infused into the Bread and Wine; "but in the very substance of His true Body and "Blood. It is not a presence of power or virtue, but "of person. . . Under those external forms there is "the *true*, *real*, and *substantial* presence of Christ's Body "and Blood animated by the living soul, and both "pervaded by the living DEITY—whole CHRIST, GOD, "and MAN."

On an earlier page, this writer says: "Christ . . . "incarnates Himself in the hands of the Priest; that "is, at the moment of consecration Christ unites Him-

"self, Body, Soul, and Divinity, in an ineffable manner "with the elements of Bread and Wine." Unhappily, this is no rare expression. Another writer declares: "There is nothing unreasonable in supposing that the "God-man would suffer Himself to be borne in the "hands of His Priests, whom He has specially sanc- "tified and called to a virgin life for that very pur- "pose." So we advance to "Hymns of Adoration to "the Blessed Sacrament:"

> "Ah, see, within a creature's hand
> The vast Creator deigns to be!
> Reposing infant-like, as though
> On Joseph's arm or Mary's knee.
> Sweet Sacrament, we Thee adore!
> Oh! make us love Thee more and more." *

The Ritualist school, therefore, explicitly teach that when I, an Anglican Presbyter, take the elements for administration, I hold, between my finger and thumb, the very Christ of God, as truly and really as, in His infancy, He was embraced in the arms of Joseph or sat on holy Mary's knees; that I give into the hands or lips of the communicant the very body, blood, soul, and Godhead of my Saviour and Lord. But is this the doctrine of the English Church? If so, it is absent from her formularies, and has been forgotten, or remembered only to be repudiated, by those divines who have

* Space forbids the multiplication of quotations, though Dr. Pusey, Mr. Bennett, and many others, give the same or closely kindred opinions. *Vide* "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," Oxford University Sermon, Christ Church, Second Sunday after Epiphany, 1853. "The Defence of the Archdeacon of Taunton," 1856. "A Plea for Toleration in the Church of England." "Sequel to the Kiss of Peace," 1868. "Oratory Worship," 1869. "The People's Mass Book."

made her theological literature famous throughout the world.

Monsignor Capel, however, is good enough to trace for us the pedigree of these unwonted doctrines. In his memorable correspondence with Canon Liddon,* referring to quotations from Ritualist books, he says, and surely he ought to know: "In these, and scores of other "passages from such books, are our doctrines of the "Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and Tran-"substantiation expressed in our own very words." Canon Liddon, as an enlightened and high-minded English Churchman, whilst regretfully acknowledging "excrescences," "parasitical growths," naturally shrank from the admission that "*transubstantiation*" is taught, however metaphysically near, perilously near, Ritualist writers had approached that doctrine; but, in reply to some remarkable quotations given by Monsignor Capel to prove that Ritualists teach that

"Bread into His flesh is turned,
Into precious blood the wine,"

Canon Liddon says: "the Real Presence, as I have "said, is one thing, while Transubstantiation is an-"other; and language which appears to your corre-"spondent to teach the latter does not teach anything "beyond the former." But in offering that defence, the learned Canon must, curiously enough, have been ignorant of the fact, that not only is the doctrine taught in words so plain that much less acute observers than Monsignor Capel could not mistake the meaning, but that the very word "*transubstantiation*" is employed and defended by Ritualists. The

* *The Times*, January, 1875.

"Directorium Anglicanum" (1866, p. 111) speaks of "the transubstantiation and consecration of the Sacra-"ment;" and an eager defence of this doctrine is put forward in a treatise entitled, "Transubstantiation," &c., by an English Churchman (London, Palmer, 1865), who says, concerning the prayer of consecration, "*Hoc est corpus meum* engages the whole "attention, and all stammering modifications of it "vanish and retire into the dry places of Protestant "theology" (p. 34). But in "The Kiss of Peace, or England and Rome at one in the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," by a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (1867), we have the most elaborate and ingenious apology for this doctrine and its bold assertion. The writer says: "The Holy Ghost, acting at the "time the Priest consecrates, effects a conversion of the "whole substance of the bread into the substance of "the body of Christ, which conversion I call Transub-"stantiation;" and, giving the sum and substance of what he has endeavoured to prove, he adds: "Therefore, "as the Church of England holds the 'Real Objective "Presence,' she must either hold the doctrine of Tran-"substantiation as well, or be prepared to cut at the roots "of all faith by contradicting and giving the lie to a "primary law of the human mind" (pp. 107, 108). And, again, he says: "Any young lad of average "intelligence, if he be true to your instructions, will "tell you respecting the consecrated elements: 'They "ARE, they have BECOME, the BODY and BLOOD "of the LORD.' And in this answer he will have "proclaimed the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation

"as the necessary, inevitable corollary of that doctrine "of the Real Objective Presence which you have "taught him. For the Church of Rome adds nothing "new here." And this English gentleman, Fellow of his College, with the mighty struggles and sufferings of the Reformation as indisputable historic facts before him, would persuade us, at least he tells us, "England "and Rome [are] at one on the doctrine of the Eucha-"rist." He knows that Article XXVIII. declares "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of "Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot "be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the "plain words of Holy Scripture, overthroweth the "nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to "many superstitions;" but, greatly daring, he would persuade us that neither the divines who framed that Article, nor the theologians, not less eminent, who subsequently defended the doctrine that it exhibits, knew the theological value of the word they used, or, if they did, then they did not mean what they said. This ingenious advocate tells us that it was not *transubstantiation* that they condemned, but *Transaccidentation;* and he proposes to petition Convocation to break down our Reformation rampart, or, at least, to open the gates to the enemy, by either the removal of the famous, but obnoxious formula, or by a distinct declaration that it is in no way opposed to the Roman doctrine of *transubstantiation.* And this is offered as a *kiss of peace.* It would be a kiss, but the kiss of betrayal.

But see how this root of error spreads, and whitherward it grows.

The doctrine of a Real Objective Presence on the "altar," is almost necessarily followed by *The Adoration of the elements.*

We find Mr. Bennett, in his "Plea for Toleration," &c. (Preface), saying: "Who myself adore, and teach "the people to adore the consecrated elements, believ- "ing Christ to be in them." In a later edition he has slightly altered the wording, but he tells us his meaning is "precisely the same" as in "the original passage." The "Little Prayer Book" (p. 40) says: "At the "consecration, adore your God, and Saviour truly "present, and say, 'Hail! Saving Victim,'" &c.

"Ring joyously ye solemn bells;
And wave, oh wave, ye censers bright!
'Tis Jesus cometh, Mary's son,
And God of God, and Light of Light.
Sweet Sacrament, we Thee adore!
Oh! make us love Thee more and more." *

In a "Manual of Devotions and Directions for Members of the Church of England, intended specially for the Young," the following directions occur: "Kneel "upright, your hands clasped upon your breast, follow "the Priest in silent awe, for Jesus thy God is very "nigh thee. He is about to descend upon the altar, "surrounded by the fire of the Holy Ghost, and "attended by the angels. At the Consecration and "Elevation prostrate yourself to the dust, and say, "'Hail! Body of my God—Hail! Body of my Redeemer, "I adore—I adore—I adore Thee.'"†

"No adoration," says the "Book of Common Prayer," is intended, or ought to be done, either unto

* "Oratory Worship." Hymn of Adoration to the Blessed Sacrament.
† For Romish and Ritualist doctrine of "Intention," Appendix I.

"the Sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, "or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural "flesh and blood."*

In the "Defence of the Archdeacon of Taunton," 1856, it is argued: "all who come to the Lord's table, "whether worthily or unworthily, have given to them, "and eat and drink, the body and blood of Christ." And further: "All those considerations which are ad- "duced from sixth of S. John, to prove that the wicked "neither eat the flesh of Christ nor drink His blood, "are nothing to the purpose" (pp. 93-95).

"Tracts for the Day," No. 3: "All worthy and "unworthy receive the *Sacramentum*, the outward "part; they all alike receive the *Res Sacramenti*, the "inward part, but only the worthy receive the *Virtus* "*Sacramenti*" (p. 79).

So that, according to this school of Ritual theologians, the faithless and even wicked men, if they take this Sacrament, do verily and indeed eat the very body and blood, soul and divinity, of Christ. But the xxixth Article says directly the opposite of this:

"The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, "although they do carnally and visibly press with "their teeth (as S. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of "the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they "partakers of Christ."

* Rubric at end of Holy Communion Office. The author of the "Kiss of Peace"—postscript—endeavours to evade the force of this condemnation by calling attention to the "Ambiguous meaning of the word 'Sacrament;'" and adds that the adoration that is offered is not to the *Signum Sacramenti*, but to the *Res Sacramenti*. To such straits are they driven who bow down to and adore the Sacrament.

From the doctrine of An Objective Corporal Presence on the Altar, we are carried to that of A Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Eucharist, for those present and those absent, living and dead.

"Tracts for the Day," No. 3: "The Seven Sacraments." "It is both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice. It is "the earthly continuation of the Great Sacrifice of "Christ ever existing in Heaven. And it is the instru- "mental means for partaking of that Sacrifice. . . . "As a Sacrifice it is the offering of Christ's Body and "Blood; as a Sacrament it is the reception of them," &c. (p. 78).

No. 5, "The Real Presence:" "We do not speak "of His Atonement as a work wholly past, but as of "one ever going on. We do not say He took away the "sins of the world at some given moment in the past, "and then left men to avail themselves as they could of "that Atonement. But we say, 'O LAMB OF GOD that "*takest* away the sins of the world.'"

In an altar manual ("The Supper of the Lord and Holy Communion"),* it is said: "We offer it" [the unbloody oblation at the altar] "in satisfaction and "atonement for all sins and crimes we have ever com- "mitted, or howsoever Thy Infinite Majesty has been "displeased or offended."

In the "Divine Liturgy and Daily Sacrifice," a Manual edited by Rev. O. Shipley,† we have the frequent recurrence of such expressions as this in the form of prayers. (1) By the priest: . . . . "Thou that hast freely given unto me, Thy "humble and unworthy servant, boldness to stand

* London, Ch. Press Co. † London, Masters, 1866.

"before Thy altar, and to offer unto Thee this tre-
"mendous and unbloody sacrifice for my sins and for
"the sins of Thy people, look upon me," &c. (p. 62).

By the people: "Receive, Holy Father, Almighty
"Everlasting God, this spotless victim which I, Thy
"unworthy servant, by the hands of Thy priest, offer
"unto Thee, the living and true God, for my number-
"less sins, offences, and negligences, and for all here
"present, as also for all Christians both living and
"dead."

"The Daily Sacrifice:"* "To the praise and glory of
"the most Holy Trinity; in memory of the Life, Passion,
"and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in
"*union* with *His works and merits;* in commemoration of
"all saints and holy men and women; *together with the*
"*prayers and praises of all the Faithful, I offer up this and*
"*all other Sacrifices, Offices, Prayers,* AND GOOD WORKS OF
"ALL THE WORLD, for my necessities, present and future,
"of body and soul; for my life and consolation; FOR
"THE REMISSION OF ALL MY SINS, for which I intend,
"strive, and desire to have true contrition; for the sal-
"vation also of my parents, relations, friends, enemies,
"benefactors, &c. . . . for . . . the *repose of the* FAITH-
"FUL DEPARTED; for all intrusted and committed to me;
"and, lastly, for *all,* EITHER QUICK OR DEAD, for whom our
"Lord Jesus Christ knows and wills that I ought to offer
"up this All-holy Sacrifice, according to the Intention of
"the Catholic Church; in the Name of the Father, and
"of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (pp. 91, 92).

"The Little Prayer Book:" "Lord, I offer to Thee
"all that I now suffer, or have yet to suffer, to be

* London, Masters, 1861.

"joined to the Sufferings of my Redeemer, and hallowed "by His Passion" (p. 47).

One of the "Hymns of Adoration to the Blessed Sacrament," in oratory worship, is as follows:

"Hail, O Flesh of Christ Divine!
Hail, O sweet and ruddy wine!
Blood the Cup, and Flesh the Meat,
And in each is Christ complete.
"This is He, the Bridegroom, dight
In His vesture red and white—
White, for Him a Virgin bore;
Red, for He His Blood did pour.
"By the wounds, and stripes, and scorn,
By the Passion Thou has borne,
Hear us, Jesu, when we call;
From destruction save us all."

But see, further, how and whither this leaven of doctrine spreads.

Fasting Communion is enjoined as a grave and solemn duty, and Evening Communion* is not merely deprecated as inexpedient, but denounced as "deadly sin."

In "Communicate Fasting"† we read: "The "true shrine of Christ is not the lifeless altar "table, but our living bodies . . . When we "are about to receive that Body and Blood into "our bodies we should take care that the resting "place of the Sacrament be not preoccupied." Again, they venture to assert: "The Church of England . . "binds her priests and people never to communicate

* The Rev. A. Stanton, writing from "St. Alban's Clergy House Feast of the Circumcision," says: "In our eyes Evening Communion "is deadly sin. For we believe it to be contrary to the mind of the "Catholic Church, which is the mind of the Holy Ghost, and any "one act deliberately done contrary to the mind of the Church is "deadly sin." † Ed. by Com. of Clergy; Palmer, 1865.

"otherwise than fasting. And what is meant by fast-
"ing in this case is total abstinence from every kind of
"food or drink, even in the very smallest quantities,
"from the preceding night."

A glass of water may not be drunk; even the teeth may not be brushed.

"The Four Cardinal Virtues"* speaks of "the "national sin of non-fasting Communion;" and also of "a painful saddening fear that many venture to "communicate non-fasting" (pp. 118, 119).

To what lengths this may proceed we see in the "Directorium Anglicanum:" "The Seventh Cautel" is: before "Mass, the Priest do not wash his mouth or teeth, but "only his lips from without with his mouth closed, as "he has need, lest perchance he should mingle the taste "of water with his saliva. After Mass, also, he should "beware of expectorations as much as possible, until he "shall have eaten and drunken, lest by chance any-
"thing shall have remained between his teeth or in his "*fauces* which, by expectorating, he might eject."

I could quote other directions, not for priests only but all communicants, forbidding not only to drink water, but to take even a cough lozenge. Well may the former Vicar of S. Mary's, Oxford, now Dean of Chichester, himself a zealous High Churchman, and an advocate of early Communion as a pious use, yet denounce "the miserable casuistry of fasting Communion."

But in this, as in even more important questions, differences prevail among Ritualists, who can only by courtesy be styled a *party*, for they lack the first necessity of party life—common agreement on differ-

* London, Longmans, 1871. Ed. by Rev. Orby Shipley.

ential questions. For Ritualist teachings differ in respect of the Presence in the Holy Eucharist, the necessity for Auricular Confession and Judicial Absolution; and whilst Mr. Stanton speaks of the "deadly sin" of Evening Communion, and Mr. Orby Shipley of the national sin of non-fasting Communions, the Rev. H. T. Kingdon, Assistant Curate of S. Andrew's, Wells Street, Vice-Principal of Salisbury Theological College, not only shows, in a very able work, "Fasting Communion Historically Investigated" (Longmans, 1875), by most careful historic examination, the non-necessity of the rule of fasting Communion; but he also adds that he has "especial leave to publish the narrative," that John Mason Neale, in his last illness, admitted "the "danger of attempting to enforce the rule in England," and "that it was not binding on persons living in the "world within our communion, and that it would be "harmful to try and enforce it." The Ritualists are a party rather by the accident of a common tendency, than by the vital cohesion of clearly ascertained and well defined principles.

Solitary Celebrations are being inculcated; the priest alone receiving in the presence of the people, or with only two or three to communicate, the congregation "assisting" but not receiving. Daily celebrations, and attendance to assist at these, are urged as "more profitable to our souls' health than attend-"ance at matins or litany;" and in certain circumstances "The Companion to the Book of Common Prayer" says: "We conclude that the Priest does not "violate the rubric when he celebrates without com-"municants" (pp. 74, 75).

The Dean of Chichester and Gresham Lecturer in Divinity, High Churchman as he is, speaks on this subject in a tone of condemnation that I do not venture to imitate, and that coming from such a quarter carries special significance. Alluding to eucharistic adoration, tinkling of a bell, schools of children brought to witness celebrations, where Romish usages are carefully reproduced, he says: "It is designed. . . to conform our "Holy Communion to Romish High Mass, where the "Priest communicates alone, and the congregation "kneel down before the host."*

Upon these Roman doctrines there almost necessarily follows, in the teaching of the Ritualist school, the arrangement, order, and use of the Roman ritual. In "The Companion to the Book of Common Prayer," and in "The Directorium Anglicanum," the dimensions of the altar are prescribed, the crosses with which it is to be adorned, the "adjuncts," "vestments," "furniture," colours; reverence is ordered to be "made towards the altar, as being the principal "part of the Church, and, as it were, the throne of "God." "This practice," says "The Companion to the Book of Common Prayer," "should be enforced by "the clergy in their choirs, by schoolmasters on their "scholars, by parents on their children, and that con-"gregations should be requested to conform thereto by "printed notices affixed to the doors of the Church" (p. 58).

But in the Rev. Dr. F. G. Lee's famous "Directorium Anglicanum" there are given directions the

* Two Sermons preached at S. Mary's, Oxford, by J. W. Burgon B.D., Vicar, &c., 1873.

most astounding—not possibly to a Romish priest, but surely to an English clergyman. Lest in the face of the examples I am about to give, you should doubt the recognized value and authority of this unique work with the Ritualist school, hear Br. Cecil, S.S.J. In the preface to "Oratory Worship," published *permissu superiorum*, speaking of the importance of minute ceremonial observance, he says: "Mr. Charles Walker's "admirable 'Sarum Directorium,' in conjunction with "the Rev. Dr. Lee's 'Directorium Anglicanum,' leaves "nothing to be desired in the matter of practical "Liturgiology."

Let us turn, then, with this eulogistic sanction, *permissu superiorum*, to this Anglican Directory. We read: "If a fly or spider, or any such thing, should fall into "the Chalice. . . . after the Consecration, the fly or "spider, or such like thing, should be warily taken, "oftentimes diligently washed between the fingers, "and should then be burnt, and with the ablution, "together with the burnt ashes, must be put in the "piscina. . . .

"If the Eucharist hath fallen to the ground, the "place where it lay must be scraped, and fire kindled "thereon, and the ashes reserved beside the altar. Also, "if by negligence any of the blood be spilled, upon a "table fixed to the floor, the Priest must take up the "drop with his tongue, and the place of the table must "be scraped, and the shavings burnt with fire, and the "ashes reserved with the relics beside the altar, and "he to whom this has befallen must do penance forty "days.

"But if the Chalice have dropped upon the altar, the

"drop must be sucked up, and the Priest must do "penance for three days.

"But if the drop have penetrated through the linen "cloth to the second linen cloth, he must do penance "for four days. If to the third, nine days. If the "drop of blood have penetrated to the fourth cloth, he "must do penance for twenty days, and the Priest or "the deacon must wash the linen coverings which the "drop has touched three times over a Chalice, and the "ablution is to be reserved with the relics. Also: if "anyone by any accident of the throat vomit up the "Eucharist, the vomit ought to be burned, and the "ashes ought to be reserved near the altar. And if it "shall be a cleric, monk, presbyter, or deacon, he must "do penance for forty days, a Bishop seventy days, a "laic thirty. But if he vomits from infirmity, he must "do penance for five days. But who does not keep the "Sacrament well, so that a mouse or other animal "devoured it, he must do penance forty days. But "whoever hath lost it, or if part thereof hath fallen "and cannot be found, he must do penance thirty days. "That Priest is worthy of the same penance by whose "negligence the consecrated host have become cor-"rupted."

Whence, then, come these "erroneous and strange doctrines?" Their accent, their vesture, their attitude and bearing are un-English; they are those of the stranger and foreigner. The Book of Common Prayer disowns them, denounces them, in Articles, Homilies, Rubrics and Formularies. They speak a tongue not understood of the common people. But Monsignor

Capel, the Romish doctor and controversialist, volunteers to be their interpreter. He says they are "our "doctrines of the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sac- "rifice, and Transubstantiation." And further, concerning the Ritualist school, he says: "We are obliged "to declare that, beyond doubt, these men are unin- "tentionally, but not the less assuredly, disseminating "several doctrines of the Roman Church." "In towns "the most populous, and hamlets the most secluded" this thing spreads; and, he adds: "Our experience "bears witness to the fact that a steady and ever- "increasing current has set in from the Ritualistic "party to the Catholic Church."

Then I protest that a party who teach doctrines of such character, and with such results, are disloyal to the constitution, and dangerous to the most sacred interests of the Anglican Church. In Rome, let men do as Rome does without reproach. One of the grand conquests of the Reformation was the right of private judgment in matters of faith; and under the ægis of Protestantism Englishmen have grown up in the great school of religious liberty—the just liberty to choose any Church and profess its faith, but not the lawlessness and licence of holding office in the Church of England and teaching the doctrines of the Church of Rome.

But now we approach another subject of the most grave and urgent moment—the correlative doctrines of *Confession and Absolution*. We all recognize the vital and universal necessity of these, but Confession to whom? Absolution by whom?

The Ritualist school teaches *the obligation of Auricular confession*, that is, confession into the ear of the Priest, and *Judicial absolution*, that is, absolution not declaratively made, by an ambassador for Christ, but authoritatively given, as a judicial act, by the Priest-Confessor.

In the "Ordinance of Confession,"* by the Rev. W. Gresley, we are told: "The giving Absolution is not a "matter of course, but is dependent on the judgment "of the Priest. He has power to retain as well as "remit sins—to give absolution or refuse it. Awful "thought! . . . . He is to act in God's stead, "whose ambassador he is. He is like a judge pro- "nouncing judgment—acquitting or else condemning "—binding or loosing" (p. 96).

"The Priest in Absolution"† tells us that in the Confessor "To the knowledge of the moral theologian "must be added the decision of a Judge" (p. 9). For "The essential form of Absolution is not to be put "forth after the manner of a prayer, but as by authority, "being a judicial act" (p. 50). And the same book declares, in its "Advertisement to the Reader," "whatever "theories people may form for themselves, the commis- "sion of absolution involves this restorative power (the "pardon of sin after baptism), and is given to Priests of "the English Church, the commission being of a uni- "versal character and not confined to baptism, nay, "if compared with the formula of the Roman Church, "the English Ritual would seem the more prominently

* London, Masters, 1852. † London, Masters, 1868.

"to set before the Priest, as *his great work*, that of bind-
"ing and loosing."

In "Why Don't you Go to Confession,"* we have this startling statement: "I must again repeat that "Confession and Absolution form God's regular channel "for conveying His forgiveness, and that if we will not "take pardon in His way, we are not likely to get it "in our own" (p. 9).

"The Evangelist's Library,† a Catechetical Series, edited by the Mission Priests of S. John the Evangelist," contains the following:

"When is Confession required? When we have com-
"mitted any mortal or greater sin."

"Is it not enough to confess to God? Not always."

"When should we confess our sins? When we need "the benefit of Absolution."

* * * *

"What is Absolution? The forgiveness of sins by the "Ministry of a Priest."

Again, in "Three Rules for a Christian Life"‡ the third rule says:

"Do not shrink from special Confession before God's "Minister; the very shame of face which such a con-
"fession may put on you will deepen your repentance, "and make you more sensible of the real character of "sin." . . . . "It is often secret sins—sins against "the 7th or 8th commandment, which most need confession." . . . . Make up your mind to the struggle, burst through their bonds, confess your sin, and your

* London, Palmer, 1872. † London, Hayes, 1868.
‡ London, Palmer, 1865, 3rd edition.

"soul will have escaped from Satan's gloomy bondage,
"like a bird from the snare of the fowler."

In "Tracts for the Day," No.1, "Priestly Absolution," p. 22, we read: "If Priestly Absolution be the Means "ordained of GOD for remitting sin, then it is fearful to "contemplate the ruin which may have been inflicted on "souls by the neglect of it. Souls have been launched "into eternity by us, unabsolved, because we did not "believe in the Power given us at our Ordination, or "we were too timid to exert it."

In Dr. Neale's "Catechetical Notes" (1869) we read: "When a penitent, perfectly contrite, cannot confess, "either through physical inability or impossibility of "obtaining a confessor, mortal sin is remitted by the "mercy of God anticipatorily. Mortal sin cannot ordi- "narily be forgiven without absolution. But the Priest "cannot loose what he has no knowledge of. There- "fore mortal sin must be confessed."

"Plain Words on Confession"* says: "Just as God "has appointed Baptism for forgiveness, and the Holy "Communion for 'the strengthening and refreshing of "our souls, by the body and blood of Christ;' so has "He most mercifully appointed a way—one way and "only one—for the certain forgiveness of sins com- "mitted after Baptism, by applying to our souls, for "this special purpose, 'the precious Blood of Christ,' "once shed for us upon the cross of suffering. That "way, and I repeat that there is no other, is Sacra- "mental Confession—Confession to a Priest" (pp. 6 and 7).

Again: "Those who have died, and there are millions

* London, 1868.

"such, must be left to the 'uncovenanted mercies of "God' in this one particular."

That certainly is *plain speaking*, but is it speaking agreeably with the formularies of the English Church? Surely that should be a question with an English Churchman. I have in my possession now the copy of a recent letter from a Ritualist Clergyman to a young lady, in which he says: "I know no "other way by which mortal sin committed after "baptism is forgiven except by Sacramental Confes-"sion and Absolution."

And yet there is a darker and a deeper deep. Another Ritualist teacher, who speaks of Confession as "the one covenanted means of forgiveness," dares to make the following terrible statement: "As has been well and truly said, by one not "long ago gone to his rest: 'The man who con-"fesses to God *may* be forgiven; he who confesses "to a Priest *must* be forgiven.'"* English Churchmen, have you so learned Christ?

But possibly you say this is only a high doctrinal theory; it cannot have any great practical effect. "Beware of the leaven." Doctrines assiduously planted have a way of rooting themselves.

"Sweet flowers are slow, and weeds make haste."

It is the boast of the Ritualist school that multitudes are being led to regular Confession. Archdeacon Denison says: "Priests by thousands are teaching and practising "private Confession and Absolution. Clergy and laity "by tens of thousands are rejoicing in the comfort,

* "Six Plain Sermons," preached at S. Michael and All Angels, Stranmore, by Richard Wilkins, Priest. London, Palmer.

"counsel, benefit;"* and I could multiply quotations, almost indefinitely, to the same effect.

In "Books for the Young," No. 1, "Confession," † we have the following instructions for our little children of the English Church:

"Do you know, my dear child, what Confession is?
"Listen attentively, and, when you quite understand,
"try to practise what I tell you as well as possible.
". . . . To confess is to go to Christ's Priest, and
"to tell him quite simply, quite openly, all the sins
"that you remember having committed. . . . . It is
"to the Priest, and to the Priest only, that a child
"must acknowledge his sins, if he desires that God
"should forgive him. Do you know why? It is
"because God, when He was on earth, gave to His
"Priests, and to them alone, the divine power of
"forgiving men their sins. . . . . Those who will
"not confess, will not be cured. . . . . You must
"tell the Priest all the sins that you remember to
"have committed; God absolutely requires this. If,
"through pride or shame, you were so unhappy as to
"hide a sin on purpose, my poor child, you would
"commit a very grave fault. You would make a bad
"Confession. Not only your sins would not be for-
"given you, but you would be a hundred times more
"guilty than before. . . . . I have known poor
"children who concealed their sins in Confession for
"years. They were very unhappy, were tormented
"with remorse, and if they had died in that state, they

* "Confession, Absolution, and Holy Communion." A Sermon. London, Parker & Co.

† London, Palmer, 1872.

" would certainly have gone to the everlasting fires of " hell " (pp. 3 and 4).

Then, lest the little shrinking modest spirit of the child falters in the unveiling of its inmost thoughts, the Confessor says: " Don't be afraid—say all—say " everything. It is very silly to hide a sin from your " Confessor, however great or however shameful it is."

Then the child is to stammer out:

" I wish to say all, but I do not know how to tell " what I have done; it is so bad."

" Well, say this to your Confessor; say simply, 'I " have done very bad things, but I do not know how " to tell them.' He will kindly help you. He will " ask you questions."

Ay, there is the danger. By his questions the Confessor may guide the thoughts and imaginations of my child into regions of impurity of which it had never dreamt. As a father, I hope I may never catch any Confessor tampering with my children. As a Priest and master in my own parish, I trust I am secure from this form of the danger; but many of you are not, therefore beware.

But your instinctive feeling of the sacred rights of parenthood, and your knowledge of the Scriptural laws of filial duty, lead you to exclaim: " It is quite im- " possible—at least in the English Church—that my " children should be taught to set aside my Christian " authority." The possible is not before us. It is the actual of which I speak. In those children's catechisms and manuals that abound, and to some of which I have referred, the Ritualist school, as you have seen, teach

children the necessity of Confession, and all the modes of it, and the young mind is leavened with principles that may, and must, in due time assert themselves, at whatever cost of authority.

In "Four Cardinal Virtues,"* by Rev. Orby Shipley, Sermon ii., "Fortitude," certain "Church privileges" are discussed; and the writer says: "The only advice "which I will give is this—take these difficulties to "your director; ask his judgment upon them; and be "guided by his decision." But of Confession, he adds: "If Confession be essential to your soul's health—of "which, mark you, my brethren, your own conscience "must be the judge, and not another's—then, neither "the wishes, nor the desires, nor the entreaties, no, nor "even the commands of any human being, should keep "you from that blessed Sacrament."

Hear that, husbands and fathers, and see what is in store for you, under a *régime* of Ritualist doctrines; for doctrines are leaven like.

The result is detailed in the "Church and the World," where in "An Autobiography" we read: "None of my relations had the least idea of my inten- "tions except one, who raised some doubts in my "mind about acting without the sanction of my "parents. But they did not much weigh with me. I "was then no longer a child. . . I felt, too, that the "interests at stake were beyond any human inter- "ference, and that I alone could be accountable for my "own soul." (1866, Art. 9.)

Here, then, is Confession in full operation, as minute

* London, Longmans, 1865.

in the details of its curious inquiry as in the Church of Rome. Indeed, Ritualist organs distinctly avow it. One of them, *The Union*, said:

"The mode of making and receiving Confession is substantially identical [*i.e.*, with that of Rome]. The same questions are asked; the same sort of penance given; the same consolation afforded; and it appears to us somewhat dishonest to pretend that it is different."

Remember, the minutest details of the life are to be traced out and laid before the Confessor. A book, called "Pardon through the Precious Blood" (Palmer, London), contains "Twelve Rules for Confession," which, it says, are by "a great master of the spiritual life:"

1. "The more pain and shame now, the greater reward and glory hereafter."

2. "Nor yet any false admissions, if the inattention or the unskilfulness of the Priest should tempt to them."

6. "Neither any concealment of sins, which is the worst of sacrilege."

8. "To be most explicit in those sins which it is the greatest pain to own."

"The Ministry of Consolation" (London, Masters) says: "Confession must be distinct, unshrinking, and complete;" and also: "Confession, the true Confession to which alone Absolution is pronounced, must be, so far as it is possible to make it, an actual forestalling of the judgment, in obedience to that command of the Church which says, 'Judge ye for yourselves

" brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord.' The " one earnest effort of the penitent must be to detail " every sin of thought, word, or deed, which he can " ever remember to have committed, as fully, un- " reservedly, and strictly, as they will be declared " in the ears of all men at the awful judgment " day, and with that same perfect freedom from all " palliation."

But for a thorough, and permit me to add, disgusting *exposé* of this system of Auricular Confession in the English Church, we must refer to the second part of a work, the first part of which is published by Masters, London—" The Priest in Absolution." Now, the first part contains very pronounced views and methods; but I had heard of a second part, obtainable only by those high in the Ritualist craft.

I wrote, however, to Mr. Masters, and received his prompt reply, that he had never published any second part. I knew it existed, and it had therefore, evidently, been published privately. Suffice it to say, after no small pains, I obtained it, with no publisher's name, but having this advertisement to the reader: " To " prevent scandal, arising from the curious or prurient " misuse of a book which treats of spiritual diseases, it " has been thought best that the sale should be con- " fined to the clergy, who desire to have at hand a sort " of *vade mecum*, for easy reference in the discharge of " their duty, as Confessors." So then, according to their own showing, an English clergyman is to have, for his guide in the Confessional, a book which to prevent scandal, must be circulated in secret, and is unfit

to bear the name of a respectable publisher. And Ritualists are right in this reserve. I cannot, in this one case, continue the method of telling Ritualists to speak for themselves, for there are parts of the book that are not fit for your ears. I give you my word they are disgusting and disgraceful. Sanchez, Liguori, Dens, and a host of others who have written treatises to guide the Romish Confessor, have been more minute in the details of their loathsome vivisections—for more obscene and loathsome chapters are not to be found in the lewdest literature—but the second part of this Ritualist hand-book, "The Priest in Absolution," directs to similar courses of inquiry, and suggests questions to be whispered in the ears of young women and married women by clergymen of the English Church which, if proclaimed on the house-top, would heat to boiling point the blood of the English people.

Around this Ritualist party there falls the shadow of some potent and honoured names, and if they fail to denounce it, they too must be held responsible for this disgraceful book.

But if you would be further informed on this general question, and see its unscripturalness and social danger, I beg to refer you to a "Lecture on Auricular Confession," &c., by the present Lord Bishop of Peterborough. The magnificent argument of the eloquent prelate moves in the lists of this debate like a mailed knight, with no openings in his harness, and with a hand too dexterous and a blade too keen for all his adversaries.*

* For a lengthened treatise on this question, covering the whole

Dr. Magee's concluding words are: "Protestant "laymen of our yet Protestant Church of England, I, "a clergyman of that Church, appeal to you to decide "this question, for to your decision it must come at "last—Have we, the clergy, the power to forgive your "sins? If we have, be consistent. Carry out this "doctrine to its necessary and legitimate consequences. "Let Dens, and Delahogue, and Sanchez, be in all our "libraries. Let 'Gardens of the Soul,' and 'Hints "for a First Confession,' be in the hands of all your "children. Let your young daughters, of twelve years "of age, come to us regularly and statedly, with their "written lists of sins, on which we shall catechise "them. Let all this be done openly and regularly, "without the dangerous romance of novelty or con-"cealment that now attends this practice. Let us take "our proper place as directors of your consciences, "masters of your wealth, rulers of your family, dicta-"tors of terms of salvation on your death-beds. Place "in our hands your English independence, your "domestic happiness, the peace, the purity of your "families, and receive in return all that we can give "you—our promise that we will be prudent, very "prudent! and then await the consequences! But if "you will not do this, if you think that neither your "morals nor your happiness would thrive under such "a system as this; if you are of opinion that the

ground of the argument, with the most masterly and trenchant completeness, *vide* "An Examination into the Doctrine and Practice of Confession," by Wm. Ed. Jelf, B.D. (Quousque). Longmans, Green & Co., 1875.

"social and political condition of those nations that "have long enjoyed this blessing of the Confessional "is not so very high that it should tempt you to "imitate them; if you desire to be still what English-"men have hitherto been—blessed in the enjoyment of "a sound faith, and pure morals, and manly integrity, "and peaceful and happy homes, then reject the false "doctrine that is fatal to all these; tell us that we have "no power to forgive, no right to rule; tell us, the "clergy, that you will receive us as teachers, not "as lawgivers—as counsellors, not as directors—as "friends, not as spies—as loved and honoured pastors, "not as feared and distrusted Confessors. Say, in a "word, that this is your faith, gathered from God's "Holy Word, taught you by our Scriptural Church, "endeared to you by the lessons of history, and the "sad experience of those who have forsaken it; that "in Christ's Church there stands between the sinner "and his God no man save one—the man Jesus "Christ."

Is this the atmosphere, are these the customs of our English Church? Tell me, have our fathers, the great luminaries of her post-Reformation history, misconceived her character and misinterpreted her methods?

Have Jewel, Hooker, Bull, Barrow, Butler, Chillingworth, Jeremy Taylor, Watson, Pearson, Paley, and a host of others, who have covered the altars of the English Church with "works more precious than the "finest gold of the ancient sanctuary of Israel," either ignorantly overlooked, or traitorously hidden, what we

are told to-day is "the one only way, and that there "is no other for forgiveness of sins"? Or those godly men of lowlier place and name,

'Multi præterea, quos fama obscura recondit,'

who in the thousands of English parishes have striven in peace and prayer to do their Church's holy work, marrying, baptizing, teaching, communicating, and laying to rest those who fell asleep, "in sure and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life," have they been guilty of omitting, either through craven fear or feeble faith, to give Absolution, thereby "inflicting fearful ruin on souls;" and instead of being, as was their hope and prayer, ministers of salvation, have they been ministers of death and despair? I vindicate their honoured memory from such a wanton imputation.

Why, in the deeply stirred and quickened life of the English Church in the last century, did not those profoundly zealous men, John and Charles Wesley, Fletcher of Madeley, Whitfield, and others, like earnest-minded, who sought eagerly for every possible appliance by which they might arouse human souls and bring them to Christ, find this method of secret minute Auricular Confession, and authoritative judicial Absolution, in their well-known and well-used Prayer Book? Why? Because the Book of Common Prayer is as innocent of this system of habitual Auricular Confession and judicial Absolution, as that primitive antiquity—the inspired documents of the first pure age of the Church—of which it is our admirable and authoritative exposition.

The late Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Phillpotts, con-

fessedly one of the most able and eminent High-Churchmen of his day, said: "So little is our Church "inclined to encourage its ministers in prying into the "secrets of their penitents, that it enjoins every other "measure to be taken before this last step is proposed." And, again: "The only case in which we urge secret "Confession is the case of him for whom nothing else "will do."*

We come now to *The Exaltation and Adoration of the B. V. Mary, as Mediatrix, and to the Saints, as Co-intercessors.*

In "Oratory Worship," dedicated to the Rev. Father Michael, S.S.J., by Br. Cecil, S.S.J.,† a book that almost deceived the very elect of Rome, Mariolatry is taught in the fullest and plainest terms. It contains a "Rosary of our Blessed Lady;" with "Five Glorious Mysteries;" and the fourth is styled

The Assumption of Our Lady.

Love of Mary.

"We offer Thee this decade, O Jesus, in honour of "the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and "beseech Thee in this Mystery to grant us, through "her intercession, tender devotion to Thy Most Holy "Mother. Amen.

"Pater, ten Aves, Gloria.

"Eyes of Mary, weep no more;
Heart of Mary, heal thy sore.
Jesus kisses thee again,
Takes thee home with Him to reign."

* Letters to C. Butler, Esq. London, 1825.
† Church Press Company, 1869.

V. The Coronation of Our Lady.

"We offer Thee this decade, O Jesus, in honour of "the Coronation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as Queen "of Heaven, and beseech Thee in this Mystery to "grant us, through her intercession, final perseverance "and a crown of glory hereafter. Amen.

"Pater, ten Aves, Gloria.

"See the angels' strange amaze
As they sing Queen Mary's praise," &c.

"SALVE REGINA.

"Hail! Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy!
Our life, our sweetness, and our hope, all hail!
Pray for us, O holy Mother of God!"

"*The Memorare.* Remember, O most gracious Virgin "Mary! that never was it known that any one who "fled to thy protection, implored thy help, or sought "thy intercession, was left unaided. Inspired with "this confidence, I fly unto thee, O Virgin of virgins! "My Mother, to thee I come; before Thee I stand "sinful and sorrowful. (Here make your petitions). "O Mother of the Word Incarnate! despise not my "petitions, but in mercy hear and answer me. Amen."

Litanies are given containing phrases the most inflated, each clause ending, "O pray for us, sweet "Mother." She is styled "Sinner's Friend," "Our "Advocate," "Mother of Salvation," "Mother of all "Grace Divine," "Mother most Inviolate."

"Lily fair among the thorns;
Burning bush, but not consumed,
Garden closed, and Aaron's rod;
O pray for us," &c.

"Portal of the Prince of Peace;
Mystic Rose, Rain on the Fleece;
Tower of David, Golden House,
Queen of Heaven, Queen of Earth,
Mistress of the Church of Christ,
Mother of our second birth.

O pray for us," &c.

Hymns of adoration and supplication are addressed to her:

"MOTHER . . . IMMACULATE, IMMACULATE.

"Break the captive fetters;
Light on blindness pour;
All our ills expelling,
Every bliss implore;
Show thyself a mother:
May the Word Divine,
Born for us thy Infant,
Hear our prayers through thine." *

And not only the Holy Mary, but "*Saint Joseph,*" the "dear Spouse of God's Mother," is made the theme of worshipful adulation, as "mighty intercessor with "God." We are to "trust in Joseph and sweet Mary."

"Dear Spouse of sweet Mary, we ask for thine aid,
Thy patronage crave and thy prayers:
Saint Joseph, blest guardian of Jesus our Lord,
Oh! soothe all our griefs and our cares."

"Next to Mary, what thy power,
Tutor of the God-made man!
Oh, shield us in temptation's hour,
Save us from sin's hateful ban.

"Alleluia! glory, Joseph!
Glory, dearest saint, to thee!
Alleluia! glory, Joseph!
Thankful praise we give to thee."

* *Vide* also "The Litany of the Blessed Virgin: Invocation of Saints and Angels," Rev. O. Shipley.

In the "Monastic Breviary" * we find this confession: "I confess to God, the Father Almighty, "before Blessed Mary, ever a Virgin, Blessed Michael, "the Archangel, Blessed John the Baptist, the Holy "Apostles, Peter and Paul, our Blessed Father Bene-"dict, all the Saints . . . . . I pray that Blessed "Mary, ever a Virgin, Blessed Michael, the Arch-"angel (order repeated as above), may pray for me to "the Lord our God" (pp. 6, 7).

In the preface of this breviary we read: "May our "Most Holy Father Benedict, and our Mother Scho-"lastica, on the lily slopes of Mount Zion, pray for "their children still sojourning in Egypt." In short, the *Union Review* † tells us, "the honour due to "the saints, their relics, and images, is part of the "honour due to Almighty God." So we learn to graft Pagan usages on the Christian Church, to have our *Dii Medioximi;* for, as our own *Homilies* say, "saints "are made to be mean intercessors and helpers to God, "as though He did not hear, or should be weary if "He did all alone." ‡ But this painful phase of Ritualist thought and teaching is discovered, to our shame, by Monsignor Capel, in his correspondence with Canon Liddon. § He says: "Much as I have seen of "Ritualistic works, and heard of Ritualistic practices, "never did I imagine it possible that any clergyman "of the Anglican Communion could publish what is

* London, Brown & Parker, 1868.

† 1867, Art. iii. "Cultus of the Saints." *Vide* also, in same number another article, "Cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary."

‡ "Homilies, Peril of Idolatry," Part III.

§ Letter, *Times*, January 16th, 1875.

" set forth by a 'Father of the Society of St. Joseph,' " on the Love of Mary, in the following:

" 'We confess ourselves unworthy to approach Thee, " therefore we unite our prayers to the all-prevailing " petitions of Thy Blessed Mother, and beseech Thee to " accept on our behalf the Sacred and Immaculate " Heart of Mary. O Saviour of the world, grant that " we who truly believe her to be the Mother of God " may be assisted by her intercession with Thee, Who " liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end. " Amen.'

" 'A FEW PLAIN DIRECTIONS FOR AWAKENING IN THE HEART A PIOUS DEVOTION TO MARY.

" 'Be careful to say daily, at 6 a.m., 12, and 6 p.m.

" 'THE ANGELUS.

" 'V. The Angel of the Lord announced to Mary.

" 'R. And she conceived by the Holy Ghost.

" 'Hail Mary, &c.

" 'V. Behold the handmaid of the Lord.

" 'R. Be it done unto me according to Thy word.

" 'Hail Mary, &c.

" 'V. And the word was made flesh.

" 'R. And dwelt amongst us.

" 'Hail Mary.

" 'Collect for Annunciation of our Lady.

" 'Constantly use the Rosary; and Little Office B.V.M.

" 'Always hear Mass on her Festivals.

" 'Keep an image or picture of Mary among your objects of piety, " and wear a medal bearing her effigy.'

" A member of this same society edits 'permissu " superiorum' (!) 'Oratory Worship.' This book is " published by the Church Press Company, Burleigh " Street, Strand, and contains, 'Benediction of the

"Blessed Sacrament,' 'Procession and Veneration of "Relics,' the 'Salve Regina,' the 'Rosary of the "Blessed Virgin,' and 'Hymns to Our Lady and St. "Joseph.' The book might, with the smallest modifi- "cation, be used by our own people. I must avow it "almost 'took me in.'"

"Almost took in" Monsignor Capel! If, then, such books "almost took in" that keen and practised disputant, what is likely to occur to many zealous and pious young men and women, who actually in our English Communion come under the fascination of this system of foreign thought? Multitudes of them, to our shame be it spoken, are being taken in; taken into the house of bondage, to feel a yoke their fathers could not bear; taken out of a home of spiritual sonship; taken out of the fresh and sunny air of that English freedom which was won by a nation's tears and blood; taken out of that personal "liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free," by the mightier agonies of His ineffable passion.

O ye devout and earnest souls, quickened with the impulse of fervent zeal, whose enthusiasm is a sacred fire, forbid that any words of mine should, even for a moment, chill your holy ardour; but let me urge you to seek the higher life within the lines, and by the methods and ministrations of your own English Church, fragrant with the incense of hallowed memories. By the example of our saintly dead, and by apostolic authority, I charge you "stand fast in the liberty where- "with Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled "again with the yoke of bondage" (Gal. vi. 1).

The bondage of a doctrine becomes the bondage of a life.

E

The "Regula S. Benedicti" has been translated from the Latin as "the earliest and most perfect example of "the Western Rule," and "to promote the desire for "*the religious life*;" and in the "Monastic Breviary for "all those fighting under the rule of our Most Holy "Father Benedict," we have a list of Monastic and Conventual establishments in England of the Benedictine order, and we find this apostrophe in the preface: "Monks and Nuns, angels of Jesus! sing- "ing mid the night shades of earth, sing on, tire not. "Your praise notes make Jesus smile, your Virgin "songs heal the wounds of the Ever-Crucified, your "wondrous adorations gather up His blood drops. . . . "Virgin choirs, sing on, tire not. Your ceaseless "*Te Deums*, your soft *Glorias*, your deep-souled *Ave* "*Marias*, your imploring *De Profundis*, your sweet- "wailed *Miserere*, all these are the chief joys of Jesus. ". . . The holy Nun she drops her beads, and "angels rejoice. . . . The Nun prays! and the harlot "is turned to God. . . . The Monks at day-break "sing their *Miserere* in the choir, and God's face is "turned away from many a sin."

The Divine Master's idea of the religious life was that of a candle set on a candlestick, that it might give light, but this system is to cover it with a bushel, or hide it under a bed (Matt. v. 15). His great intercession was, "I pray not that thou shouldest take them "out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them "from the evil" (John xvii. 15).

Masses, so termed, *and Prayers for the Dead are taught and used by the Ritualist school.*

In the "Compn. to the Book of Common Prayer" we have "The Liturgy of the Departed:" "The Holy "Sacrifice should always be offered up at the funeral, "and those near relations and friends who are unable to "attend should request the Priest of the church or "chapel they attend to celebrate the Eucharist on "behalf of their departed friend or relative, if possible, "on the day of the funeral. The ordinary daily "Eucharist should never be offered up specially for "any one departed, if on a holy day, or within an "octave, but on the next feria. The friends and near "relatives of a deceased person should also procure "the Holy Oblation to be offered on his or her behalf, "at the church or chapel they attend, on the anniver- "sary of his or her death. When the ordinary daily "celebration is to be a Eucharist for the dead, or when "there is to be an additional celebration for the same, "notice thereof should be fixed on all the church doors "at the beginning of the week, after this form:

"1st. The Holy Sacrifice will be offered up for the "repose of the soul of N. or M., who departed this "life. . . . May his or her soul, and the souls of all the "faithful departed, rest in peace.

"2nd. The Holy Sacrifice will be offered up on . . . "for the repose of the soul of . . . whose anniversary "occurs about this time. May his or her soul, &c.

"When the Curate receives notice of the death of a "member of his congregation, he should affix the notice "following on all the church doors:

"Of your charity, pray for the repose of the soul of ". . . who departed this life . . . May his soul, &c."

Catechisms and Manuals abound containing like

teachings. In the "Altar Manual" (London, Palmer): "We beseech Thee, O LORD GOD Almighty, for the "souls of the faithful departed [especially . . .], that "this great Sacrament of Thy love may be unto them "salvation, joy, and refreshment" (pp. 34, 35).

A Collect for a Funeral: "O Lord, look graciously, "we beseech Thee, upon this Sacrifice, which we offer "to Thee for the repose of the soul of Thy servant N., "and grant that the medicine which Thou hast "vouchsafed to provide for the healing of all living, "may avail for the perfecting of the departed. Through "Jesus, etc."

In the "Little Prayer Book," amid many other similar forms, we find the following: "Grant, Lord "Jesus, that the Oblation of Thy Body and Blood, "which is here renewed in mystery, and is made under "the form of bread and wine, may effectually obtain "its proper fruit; and that thereby the living may "obtain grace, the faithful departed rest, and those for "whom the Sacrifice is offered mercy and life ever-"lasting" (p. 64).

But what says the "Great Prayer Book?" not the "Little Prayer Book," and its little kindred, the private productions of unauthorized formularists, but the Book of Common Prayer — the common land of religious doctrines and worship for English Churchmen? It recognizes no such collects or customs. Nay, but in language to be understood by all, it declares: "The "Romish doctrines concerning Purgatory, Pardons, "Worshipping, and Adoration, as well of images as of "reliques, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond "thing vainly invented and grounded upon no war-

"ranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word "of God" (Article XXII).

And other doctrines equally unfamiliar and foreign are taught and enjoined.

"*The Seven Sacraments*" are discussed and defended in No. 3 "Tracts for the Day," closing with "The "Sacrament of Unction," which, we are told, is "the soothing medicament . . . by which the Holy "Spirit restores the suffering inner life to health and "to God's favour."

In "Sermons on Sin," by Rev. Orby Shipley (1868, Sermon III.), it is stated that "There are seven Sacra- "ments and personal extensions of the Incarnation of "God;" and he says, "The seventh and last Sacra- "mental extension of the Incarnation of our God, I "need not tell you, my brethren, in theological "language is termed the Sacrament of Penance." "Not a single step can be taken in the supernatural "life without the co-operation of Sacraments; not an "advance can be made; not an end can be gained." "The Catholic Faith is a religion of Sacraments." The daily "Celebration of the Eucharist" is urged in preference to "Matins:" "The obligatory daily ser- "vice in all collegiate and school chapels should be the "Eucharist and not Matins, unless it be thought ex- "pedient to make attendance at both compulsory." "Comp. to the Book of Common Prayer" (see page 75).

Article XXXIII. says: "The Sacrament of the "Lord's Supper was not by Christian ordinance "reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." But the Ritualist school says: "It is well to have the

"Blessed Sacrament reserved in the church (where "this may be done), but especially in collegiate and "monastic chapels, where it should always be re- "served. The Priest should, on due notice being "given, carry it from thence in the pyx (in both kinds, "of course) to the sick man's house. . . . . The "Priest carries the blessed Sacrament in a monstrance "(as described in appendix for reservation in both "kinds), or he will carry it in the chalice, the Holy "Body being placed previously therein by him, soaked "in a few drops of the precious Blood, the chalice "being covered with a white veil and burse, with a "corporal folded inside."*

"The Sequel to the Kiss of Peace," argues that "They "see no more difficulty in the monstrance than in the "manger—in the ciborium than in the cradle; Christ "present to them in the tabernacle is no more strange "to them than Christ teaching in the temple; Christ "carried in the streets of Rome to receive the homage "of the faithful is to them no more a profanation of "things holy than Christ entering Jerusalem amid "the hosannas of the children, 'Meek and sitting "upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass'" (p. 79).

As we have seen, *Monastic and Conventual Institutions* are established by the Ritualist school; with monkish customs, and nuns entirely enclosed. Alas, how completely have they been "taken in!" Severed from home, the ties of kin and friendship broken, the offices of social and domestic life forsaken, the most gracious and ennobling affections of the human heart "hid in

* "The Ritual of the Anglican Clergy," p. 23.

the earth," and the broad battle ground of life, on which "the Captain of *our* salvation" has promised that faithful souls shall be "more than conqueror," reduced to the selfish seclusion of a cloister and a cell.

The Veneration and Procession of Relics are also appointed and arranged.

In "Oratory Worship" we are instructed thus: "The church and way by which the procession "[of the relics] is to pass being decorated as "becomingly as possible, let the ministers, vested in "the colour of the chief Saint whose relics are carried, "and the others march with lighted candles, sing-"ing Litanies of Invocation, &c. . . . . It is well, "when the relics are to be exposed, to erect a resting-"place for them just within the chancel, or in some "place calculated to facilitate the veneration of the "faithful. This, which may be constructed in the "shape of a grotto, should be decorated with flowers, "and, when containing the relics, with at least four "lighted candles."

Then follow minute directions as to vestments, order of procession, Priest's assistants, image bearers, acolytes, "the Thurifer on the Smoking Thurible," and the naviçula bearer:—

"Little girls in white veils and dresses trimmed "with 'ladye' blue," &c.

"An image of Our Blessed Lady carried on a plat-"form," &c.

"Sisterhoods, Guilds, Confraternities following."

"The officiant carrying the reliquary on a velvet cushion," &c.

"Members of the congregation at a respectful "distance."

"The altar is to be brilliantly lighted. Incense "should be burnt, but not offered."

* * * *

"After the *Te Deum* the officiant and his ministers "should proceed to the chancel gates, and there hold "the inner relic-case to be kissed by the faithful, "wiping the glass after each osculation with a piece "of cotton wool."

What has all this to do with English Churchmanship, or with Primitive Christianity?

The *Celibacy of the Priesthood is urged emphatically.*

The *Church News* October 13, 1869, desiderates the enactment of "Some stringent law or canon "making the reception of at least Priests' orders a "bar to subsequent marriage on pain of perpetual "irregularity."

But celibacy reaching beyond the limits of the priesthood is urged. In "Three Vows," by Rev. W. Humphreys, it is said, "Perpetual continence is "requisite in order to religion."

The *Church News* is "perfectly convinced," it says, of the desirability of "the celibate life for men;" but when the men are celibate, who will marry the women? So it is celibacy all round that this organ urges, as largely desirable in the Christian Church. The quotation (April 7, 1869) is: "We are perfectly "convinced that until the celibate life for men, and "especially for Priests, is very widely recognized and

"practised among us, we shall be lacking in an im-
"portant feature necessary to the perfection of the
"Christian Church." Therefore the hope of "the
"perfection of a Christian Church" increases with the diminution of the human race, and is, I suppose, fulfilled by its extinction!

What an outrage is all this on the methods of divine appointment, and all those sweet and gracious associations, that live like music in the words father, mother, child, and home.

Why this very proposal is an anachronism. It is to revert to that coarse, materialistic admiration for celibacy which is always the degradation of woman, and has been more than once the ruin of society. It strikes at the very root of that family and social life which are a sacred product of the Christian Church, and the sure strength of nations. Man and woman are not separate and independent quantities in the great problem of human life; they are the mutual complement the one of the other. Man attains his highest development only under the sweet and gracious influence of woman; and she finds the level of a nobler life through man:

> "In the long years liker must they grow;
> The man be more of woman, she of man;
> He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
> Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world;
> She mental breadth, nor fail in childward care,
> Nor lose the childlike in the larger mind;
> Till at the last she set herself to man
> Like perfect music unto noble words." *

But the Ritualistic proposal for the religious separa-

* Tennyson, "The Princess."

tion of the sexes is a burrowing back into the grave of buried blunders, whereas we ought rather to be giving grateful welcome to the advancing movement of truer thought and nobler life.

But time fails, and I would fain hope that it is needless to track further this system of foreign thought and alien practice. "Ohe! jam satis est."

The Church of England gives prime authority to the Revealed Word of God, declaring in her grand Sixth Article: "Holy Scripture containeth all things neces-
"sary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein,
"nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of
"any man as an article of the Faith, or be thought
"requisite or necessary to salvation." The question naturally arises, How is it possible for men who have been trained in the Scriptural Theology of the English Church thus to depart from "the faith once delivered
"to the saints"? Why, by setting up another authority that comes between God and the individual conscience.

In "The Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass Explained," we read: "Scripture to a Catholic is not
"what the Protestant professes to regard it, or
"imagines it to be. The Protestant, as I said at the
"beginning, holds the Bible alone to be his teacher,
"and maintains that all he need believe is expressly
"written therein, and may be conclusively proved
"thereby; both which assertions the Catholic denies.
"To require a Catholic to quote chapter and verse for
"the doctrine of the Mass, as if that nature of proof
"were necessary for his position, is to try to get

* London, Burns Lambert, 1854, Tract III.

" him to establish the Catholic Faith on Protestant " grounds."

And this is the reasoning of a school of English Churchmen who have signed the Sixth Article. The " Companion to the Book of Common Prayer " teaches that not Scripture, but the authority of the Church is supreme. It says that our Lord has " invested a " body of men with the same authority over the " Church as that possessed by our Lord Himself;" that the " Collective Episcopate is authorized and fitted " to be the infallible expounder of the Word of God;" and further, " It is likewise necessary to everlasting " salvation to submit to the authority of the Church, " inasmuch as she is the only authorized Guardian and " Expositor of the Scriptures; and that it is so " hard to be understood, and so liable to be mis- " interpreted, that to circulate the Bible without the " comments of the Church may result in the spiritual " destruction of the interpreter."* (Preface).

But the Master said: " Search the Scriptures, for in " them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are " they which testify of Me" (John v. 39). S. Paul made it a subject of congratulation to the youthful Timothy: " From a child thou hast known "—not tradition or Church authority, but—" the Holy Scrip-

* " Bible truths should not be taught on Church authority, but on the authority of *God*. Many make a fatal mistake here: they confound authority with testimony. We may avail ourselves of the testimony of the Church in regard to Scriptural doctrine, but we receive it only on the authority of the *Bible*. If we receive truth on the authority of the Church, then *whatever* has the authority of the Church must be received as truth, whatever it may be, or however false."

"tures, which are able to make thee wise unto salva-
"tion through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All
"Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is
"profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for
"instruction in righteousness: That the man of God
"may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good
"works" (2 Tim. iii. 15–17). But this school of Ritualist teaching differs from Christ and Paul, as well as from our own Articles, and urges that an open Bible is a peril to souls. "There are a great many per-
"sons," says the Rev. J. E. Vaux, "who are under the
"impression that the Bible is intended to teach us our
"religion. Let me say most distinctly and definitely
"that this is a thorough mistake."*

Another writer, already quoted, offers the following in his "Sequel to the Kiss of Peace" (p. 59): "If all
"the Bibles in the world could be gathered together
"to-morrow into one place and cast into the sea, I
"see nothing to hinder the Christian Mission spread-
"ing in the world, in the same way as it spread
"between the years 33 and 8 A.D. (or whatever date
"may be assigned for the completion of the New
"Testament canon). Neither, to take a practical case,
"which involves no such extravagant hypothesis, do
"I think that a Christian Priest, sent to a heathen
"land to win converts to the Faith, has any need to
"take a Bible with him, or any call to use it with
"the heathen previous to their baptism, or in any
"sense to treat it as a necessary element in the work
"of conviction."

* "An Open Bible," p. 18.

I will only reply, if unhappily the time should ever come when the English Church "casts her Bibles into the sea," and sends forth her missionaries without their Bibles; in other words, if an "Infallible Episcopate," or "Church authority," or "Catholic tradition," should become her authorities, instead of God's written word, may her days be speedily numbered, and may those sacred fanes that have resounded with the worship of long generations be forsaken by the English people, and stand desolate, the monuments of a great stewardship betrayed; unless by the grace of God, in a second and more radical Reformation, they should be restored as the hallowed shrines of a Catholic and Scriptural service for this state and nation.

But it is urged, these are good men, earnest and indefatigable in their work, even if their methods be somewhat novel. As to the last clause, let me say, I object to no practice simply because it is new, any more than I would maintain customs simply because they are old. Paul and Silas proclaimed new things to the people, and, by the way, it was generally what may be called "Church authority" that persecuted them, backed sometimes, as at Thessalonica, by "lewd fellows "of the baser sort." But being come by night into Berea, they found a higher quality of mind and temper —"οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν εὐγενέστεροι"—these were better bred, *generosiores*, as the Vulgate has it, "nobler minded "than they of Thessalonica, in that they received the "word with all readiness, and searched the Scriptures "daily whether those things were so" (Acts xvii. 11). Let us imitate this honoured example of frankness and

fidelity. The Holy Scriptures are the safeguards of the Church, and in their Divine treasury the well instructed find things both new and old.

As to the assertion in respect of the zeal and earnestness of the Ritualist party, God forbid that I should deny it or even ignore it—that I should allow even radical differences of opinion to blind my eyes or close my heart against the recognition of good, wherever found. Once for all, I pay a cheerful tribute to the abundant labours and the devout piety of a large proportion of the Ritualist clergy, for in these respects they are not one whit behind their clerical brethren of the Low or the High Church parties. Thank God, to-day no section of English Churchmen has any monopoly of zeal and devotion.

I rejoice, too, to admit how much spiritual insight, deep self-scrutiny, and pious instruction are to be found in scores of the Ritualist works that I have examined. Alas, that these high qualities should be tainted with doctrines and practices, as we have seen, utterly opposed to the distinctive teachings of the English Church, perilous and pernicious to the most sacred interests of the spiritual life: "Dead flies cause the ointment of "the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour" (Ecc. x. 1).

But I pray for the swift coming of a happier time for our Communion, when earnest, zealous, and devoted clergy will refuse to be misled—led out of the letter and spirit of their own honoured and ancient Church, into another Communion upon which the shadow and the shame of many corruptions has fallen; when the

men of different schools, and with, it may be, somewhat different methods, shall yet, in the spirit of a fervent loyalty, present at the feet of the One Lord offerings of zeal and devotion, and the whole house shall be filled with the odour of their united offering.

Further, it is often urged that it is not the intention of the Ritualist school to pervert the minds of the people from the distinctive principles of our Anglican Communion.

Sirs, it is not a question of intention, but of fact. What would be thought of me, if I should say I had no intention to spoil the field and corrupt the harvest of my neighbour; but if, notwithstanding, I went at night and sowed *zizania*, a bastard wheat, on his field? When the fruits of my folly or my crime became apparent, it would be said justly, "An enemy hath done this" (Matt. xiii. 28).

Have I not shown that the Ritualist party are sowing Roman tares in the Apostolic enclosure of our Anglican Communion? and whatever may be the intention of the worker, the work is disastrous. In the charity that hopeth all things, I desire to acquit the rank and file of the Ritualist party of any deliberate and self-recognized plan of disloyal perversion of the English Church. But they are tools in cunning hands; they are being led on by daring but wary chiefs—by whom commissioned I say not—who have avowed their unmitigated hatred of the English Reformers, their hostility to the entire work of the Reformation, and their persistent purpose to undo it, and bring the English Church under the Roman yoke.

In a lecture on "Innovations" * by Dr. F. G. Littledale, he speaks of "that young tiger-cub, Edward VI.;" of Cranmer being "arrested in his wicked career by "Divine vengeance." He talks of "such a set of mis-"creants as the leading English and Scotch Reformers;" and adds, "we do not make heroes and martyrs of "Robespierre, Danton, Marat, S. Just, Couthon, and "the like, nor do we pity them when the axe, whetted "for their feodal tyrants,' fell on them in turn. Yet "they merit quite as much admiration and respect as "Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and others who happened "to have the ill-luck to be worsted in a struggle wherein "they meant to serve their adversaries as they were "served themselves" (pp. 15, 16). "But," says Mr. Ffoulkes, himself for a time a pervert to Rome, and writing whilst yet a Roman Catholic, before his eyes were so opened by honest research as to bring him back to the Anglican Church, "I thought then" [*i.e.*, before his perversion], "and am doubly convinced now, after "reading Ecclesiastical History through again, as "a Roman Catholic, that if ever there was a "justifiable revolt from authority, it was the revolt we "call the Reformation."†

The *Church News* (Feb. 19, 1868), in reply to a just observation of Dean Bickersteth that the Church of England would forfeit her very *raison d'être* if she were faithless to the principles of the Reformers, says: "What, we should like to know, "has the Church of England to do with the spirit and

* London, Simpkin & Marshall, 1866.

† "The Church's Creed and the Crown's Creed." London, Hayes.

"principles of the Reformers, except to get rid of "them as soon as possible? As Hurrell Froude said "long ago, we will have nothing to do with such a "set."

The *Union Review*, Vol. V., in a most monitory article, says, among other statements as bad and worse: "We hope to find one strong force of attraction to "draw not only the Protestant to us, but both to you. "But when? Ah! when? The time cannot be so "very far off . . . say twenty years hence [1867], "Catholicism will have so leavened our Church that "she herself in her corporate capacity, and not a mere "small section of her like ourselves, will be able to "come to you [the Roman Church] and say, 'Let the "lands which political force and not spiritual choice "have parted these three hundred years be once more "joined. We are one with you in Faith, and have a "common Foe to fight. There may be a few diver-"gences of practice on our side. We seek to make "no terms; we come only in the spirit of love and "humility; but at the same time we feel sure that the "Chief Shepherd of the Flock of Christ [the Pope] "will deal tenderly with us, and place no yoke upon "us which we are not able to bear." And what Cardinal Wiseman foresaw and aimed at, and that his successor equally sees, this writer urges: "Depend "upon it, it is only through the English Church itself "that England can be Catholicized.'"

The *Church Times* (January 28, 1870) says, speaking of the doctrines of the Reformation: "We "do not lose sight of them at all. We are busy in

"hunting them down, and have no intention of fore-
"going the chase till we have extirpated them. That
"is plain speaking enough, we trust." It is plain speaking for English Churchmen, very disgraceful speaking. In another issue the same journal (September 3, 1869) speaks of "The monstrous figment of "Protestantism;" and again, of "Extirpating that "ulcerous cancer of Protestantism, which must be "fatal sooner or later to any Church that does not use "moral steel and fire upon it." How far is this temper from the use of that literal fire and steel with which Rome has so often assailed the Protestant faith?

"The Reunion of Christendom," 1867, edited by Dr. Lee, and with a preface by Dr. Pusey, contains the following passage: "The marvel is that Roman "Catholics do not see the wisdom of aiding us to "their uttermost. Admitting that we are but a lay "body with no pretensions to the name of a Church, "we yet, in our belief (however mistaken) that we are "one, are doing for England what they cannot do. "We are teaching men to believe that God is to be "worshipped under the form of Bread, and they are "learning the lesson from us which they have refused "to learn from the Roman teachers that have been "among us for the last 300 years. We are teaching "men to endure willingly the pain of Confession, which "is an intense trial to the reserved Anglo-Saxon, and "to believe that a man's 'I absolve thee,' is the voice "of God. . . . On any hypothesis we are doing "their work" (p. 187).

Well may the *Edinburgh Review*, giving this quotation, style it "a monstrous passage"—monstrous, proceeding from any writer, but scandalous when penned, prefaced, and edited by English Churchmen. But so the danger grows. (*Ed. Rev.* April, 1875.)

A renowned Ritualist chief speaks of "that cold, "miserable, unloving, godless figment called Pro-"testantism." But the Church of England is neither "cold, miserable, unloving, nor godless;" and she is, I affirm, a Protestant Church. In making that protest on her behalf, I subject myself to a Ritualistic anathema, but like its Roman prototype it is quite harmless, for the free Protestant air of England is a non-conductor to this kind of fulmination.

"I say anathema to the principles of Protestantism," says this English clergyman, "and to all its forms, "and sects, and denominations. Likewise to all "persons who knowingly and willingly, and under-"standing what they do, shall assert, either for them-"selves or for the Church of England, the principles "of Protestantism." But for myself and for the English Church—the anathema notwithstanding—I assert the principle of Protestantism. Not, be it understood, a merely negative, but an affirmative Protestantism. And the word in its very derivation —*pro testis*—asserts its affirmative character, a witness for rather than against. Let us then redeem a noble name from misuse. Its first historic employment at the Second Diet of Spires (1529) no longer gives the measure of its meaning; any more than the Roman *Sacramentum* covers the ground of our higher word

Sacrament. But even the memorable protest of the German Princes against Roman error, by consequence, affirmed the corresponding truth. Protestantism, however, as understood by English Churchmen, comprehends the ancient Catholic Faith, but condemns non-Catholic additions. Anglican Protestantism affirms the creeds of the Primitive Church, as declared by the first four Œcumenical Councils, but it denies and repudiates the perversions of later ages. The Church of England, therefore, is Catholic, but not Roman; Protestant, not Popish; the grandest apologist of ancient Catholicity, but the most effective antagonist of Papal corruptions. It is true, happily true, what Cardinal Manning recently declared with such bold emphasis: "Englishmen never rejected the Catholic Faith;"* but happily it is equally true that they did reject, do reject, and *Dei gratiâ* will continue to reject the machinations of the Roman schism:

"For we are many of us Catholics, but few Papists."†

It might be hoped that such ultra-Ritualist violence of language would frustrate its own purpose. But these are incautious outbursts that give proof of hidden fires; not the usual methods of advancement. And of this Roman advancement through Ritualistic activity let us take the testimony of competent authority. Cardinal Manning boasts: "At this period "of our history the supremacy of the Vicar of Jesus "Christ re-enters as full of life as when Henry VIII. "resisted Clement VII., and Elizabeth withstood

* Sermon, S. Augustine's, Manchester, Sep. 5, 1875.

† Tennyson, "Queen Mary," Scene i.

"Pius V. The undying authority of the Holy See "is once more an active power in England; the "shadow of Peter has fallen again upon it." "The "air is full of it. Call it a plague of frogs, or flies, "or of boils. It is upon man and beast. Throw "ashes into the air, it comes down Popery." "I go "on to say that at this time [under a previously named "limitation] the doctrine of the Sacraments, their "nature, number, and grace, the Intercession and "Invocation of Saints, the power of the Priesthood in "sacrifice and absolution, the excellence and obliga- "tions of the religious life, are all held and taught by "clergymen of the Church of England. Add to this "the practice of Confession and of works of temporal "and spiritual mercy in form and rule borrowed from "the Catholic Church, are all to be found among those "who are still within the Anglican Communion. I "must also add the latest and strangest phenomenon "of this movement, the adoption of an elaborate "ritual, with its vestments borrowed from the Catholic "Church."* Is it surprising, then, that he exults in the "steady current of return to the Catholic and "Roman Church throughout England."

Monsignor Capel says: "Our experience bears witness "to the fact that a steady and ever-increasing current "has set in from the Ritualistic party to the Catholic "Church. The Church of England is being gradually "leavened with Catholic doctrine." That was no fugitive statement. The Monsignor said last autumn,

* "Essays on Religion and Literature," edited by Cardinal Manning. Longmans, 1867. Inaugural Address by Editor.

speaking of the Ritualist party, and the dissensions that they are causing: "They knew the result of "this party's work here in England. Day by day "they were leading men step by step unconsciously "to the great Church of God. They were day by "day sending their people—much against their will— "by scores, by hundreds, into the true Church of God. "And if this were the case now, when the movement "dated only from some forty years, what would it be "in twenty more years?" *

And on this ground he exhorts the Roman Church to anticipate and prepare for great things.

The *Weekly Register* says: "In England the work of "conversion has continued during the past year with "steady and not very slow steps. To name, or even "indicate, individuals who have been received during "the past twelve months would be foreign to our "purpose. This much we may say (and say with "truth, the facts being known to many Catholics in "London), that the number of converts in London "alone has been upwards of 2,000 during the past "year, and has during the last few weeks increased "very much. Many, as we are informed, have joined us "who were all but Catholics, and who had little need of "instruction before they made up their minds to take "the final, the long deferred, but the all-needful step. "From every Ritualistic congregation in London there "is a continual stream of converts drifting towards us, "and the number would be increased had we Priests

* Reply to Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone's "Political Expostulations." Sermon, Salford: August, 1875. (*Manchester Guardian*).

"sufficient to look after those who are hesitating as to "this future step in the right direction. In various "parts of the country different Anglican clergymen have "been received into the Church, to the number of "some ten or a dozen, and at least as many ladies "connected with various Anglican sisterhoods have "followed in the same direction. Out of every twenty "Anglicans who joined the Catholic Church, not less "than seventeen have been prepared for the step by "the teaching they have heard from Ritualistic pulpits, "and by the practices they have got accustomed to in "Ritualistic churches. Not only laymen, but Anglican "clergymen have been seen devoutly hearing mass at "Catholic churches, rather than go to their own places "of worship, where what they considered heresy was "taught." (January 1, 1871.)

And, again, the same paper says of the Ritualist movement: "It no doubt will progress until the day "when High Mass will once more be sung in West-"minster Abbey." The *Union Review* (Vol. V. p. 412) plainly confesses "the work now going on in England "is an earnest and carefully organized attempt on the "part of a rapidly increasing body of Priests and lay-"men to bring our Church and country up to the full "standard of Catholic faith and practice, and eventually "to plead for her union with Rome."

Here, then, we have a party in the English Church convicted, not by my assertion, but by their own showing, of teaching distinctively Romanist doctrine, confessedly with the purpose of obliterating the work of the Reformation and Romanizing our Anglican Com-

munion; and on the testimony of high Roman ecclesiastics and journals, they are succeeding in their purpose by "leavening the English Church with "Catholic doctrine," and sending an "ever-increasing "stream" of perverts to Rome.

I demand calmly, but firmly, ought these things so to be at any time; but specially at the present time? Why the present time? Because the present time is eminently critical. This is no cuckoo cry.

The First Lord of the Treasury, whose keen and statesmanlike foresight few will deny, said, with marked emphasis, when urging the House to deal firmly with the Public Worship Regulation Bill: "There is also another reason why at this time I am "most anxious that the House should not take a false "step in this particular. I have hinted it before, but "I will now express it with more clearness. My con-"viction is, that however tranquil the state of Europe ". . . . there are agencies at work at this moment "which are preparing a period of great disturbance."

And his distinguished predecessor in the same exalted office has deemed it needful to urge a political expostulation with the Church of Rome, because of those advances it is resolutely making, not only upon the precious legacy of Christian truth, but also upon the cherished rights of civil liberty.

And the German Ambassador at the Court of St. James's, said, in a public speech, in May, 1875, referring to the struggle with Romish aggression in Germany "I hope that struggle will be spared to this country "for some time; but I think you had better look out

"in time. I think you see in Ireland what is going "on; I think you have not to look too far to see "what is preparing, and what will be the case in "this country."

It savours of impertinence to say that these illustrious statesmen, leaders of the two great political parties of this Realm, and the representative in England of the greatest Continental power, are not beside themselves, but speak the words of truth and soberness. Great reputations are not to be lightly hazarded. They have looked behind the scenes, and know much that we don't know. But we know enough to know how right they are. Never has there been a time in our history when a more keen and crafty effort was being made to pervert this nation. "This nineteenth cen- "tury," says Cardinal Manning, addressing the Third Provincial Council of Westminster, "will make a great "epoch in the history of the Church. . . . It is good "for us to be here in England. It is yours, Right "Rev. Fathers, to subjugate and to subdue, to bend "and to break, the will of an imperial race, the will "which, as of Rome of old, rules over nations and "people, invincible and inflexible. . . . You have a "great commission to fulfil, and great is the prize for "which you strive. Surely a soldier's eye and a "soldier's heart would choose by intuition this field of "England for the warfare of Faith. None ampler or "nobler could be found. . . . It is the head of Pro- "testantism, the centre of its movements, and the "stronghold of its powers. Weakened in England, it "is paralyzed everywhere; conquered in England, it

"is conquered throughout the world; once overthrown "here, all is but a war of detail. All the roads of the "whole world meet in one point, and this point reached, "the whole world lies open to the Church's will. "England is the key of the whole position of modern "error." *

But this ambitious will chafes in front of the battlements of the Anglican Church. Rome held them once, and England was her vassal; but at the Reformation the State regained her ecclesiastical independence, and made invincible the bulwarks of her national defence; or, if not, they must be made invincible now. Never again may the citadel of the National Church be under the control of the Papacy. "The Church of "Rome," says the great political economist, Adam Smith, "is the most formidable combination that was "ever formed against the authority and security of "civil government, as well as against the liberty, "reason, and happiness of mankind."† It is not safe for England, then, that Rome should find a readier way to the national heart; but it would be flat treachery or crass credulity for the watchmen on the walls of the Protestant fortress to open the gates to the Roman adversary. And the danger is imminent. "Protestantism," says Cardinal Manning, "conquered "in England, is conquered throughout the world."

* "Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects," by Henry Edward Manning, D.D. Dublin, 1863. Sermon III.

† "Wealth of Nations," Bk. V. c. 1. pt. iii. art. 3. *See* also Mr. Gladstone's Political Expostulation "The Vatican Decrees, and their bearing on Civil Allegiance." 1875.

But Mr. Gladstone tells us that "those who aim at "Romanizing the English Church are, at worst, a "handful."

The story of Sacred Ilium is a favourite study of that distinguished Homeric scholar; and he does not forget how one wily Greek, with, at worst, a handful of daring warriors, achieved in a night the destruction of that city which for years had defied all the powers of Larissæan Achilles, and his mighty chiefs.

. . . "Captique dolis, lacrymisque coactis
"Quos neque Tydides, nec Larissæus Achilles,
"Non anni domuere decem, non mille carinæ."*

Mr. Gladstone, however, acknowledges that "persons "in high authority" have declared that a "large "portion both of clergy and laity entertain the desire "to Romanize the Church;" and he justly adds, "if so, "our position is formidable, and we are preparing to "shoot Niagara." †

It is formidable; and it cannot be consistent with the duty of English Churchmen or the English people to stand idly by in such a crisis whilst "persons in high "authority" settle whether the number is greater or less of those who, whether of the crew or the passengers, are using every method to steer the vessel into the irresistible current of the rapids. On the contrary, I hold it is a duty that we owe to our Church, our country, and our children, to frustrate with discreet but unfaltering resolution the efforts of any number, greater or less, of disloyal men, whoever they may

* "Æneid," lib. 11, v. 196, *et seq.*
† Art. in *Contemporary Review*, June, 1875.

be, that seek to re-Romanize the National Church of England, and who venture to lend the aid of her Reformed Communion to further the enterprise of leading back the free people of this realm to the spiritual servitude and the civil degradation of the Roman obedience.

I speak with no spirit of partisan bitterness, with no desire to "shift the balance of doctrinal expression in "the Church of England," to disturb the integrity of the Book of Common Prayer, nor to narrow the constitutional breadth of our National Communion, for I rejoice in the freedom and toleration which comprehends within one "household of faith" different schools of loyal thought, "High" or "Low;" but I appeal against those who break the laws, violate the customs, defy the authority, and would revolutionize the spirit and character of the National Church. And in respect of all such, there is required prompt and unhesitating action.

Believe me, the question we are discussing is not one of "High" or "Low" Church; neither of these historic parties is touched by the articles of this impeachment. Much less is this a question of somewhat more or less of music, ornament, or elaboration in Divine worship. Tastes differ, and the Church is generous. These are but "mint, anise and cummin." This is a weightier matter. Ritualism is not a question of dresses, but of doctrine; not of spectacular ceremonial, but of some of the most radical convictions of our ancient faith. Triflers who flutter around an elaborate ritual, or unstable souls who are beguiled by

the glamour of a sensuous sacerdotalism, may be innocent of the great issues that are at stake. The leaders of this movement know them well. They are consciously using those weapons of religious dogma and Church authority that are sharper than any two-edged sword, and that have been mighty on some of the greatest battle fields of human thought. Ritualism assails within the fortress of the National Established Church those distinctive principles of the Reformed Faith of which for centuries she has been the constituted guardian and the accomplished exponent; but if, through any disastrous process, she should become unfaithful or unequal to this high stewardship, her days are numbered. Neither her antiquity, her learning, nor her zeal could save her. The English people will never tolerate a recreant or retrograde Church. And when the Church of England falls, she falls not alone. Ancient institutions will be shaken, cherished privileges imperilled. The throne will lose an ally, and the people a friend. I appeal, therefore, not alone to English Churchmen, but also to English citizens, to guard with jealous care the National Church. She is one of the ancient common rights of the people—the primitive Church of England. She was cradled in the infancy of the nation. They grew with each other's growth, and strengthened with each other's strength. When the Church was overpowered the people were oppressed. The bondage of the Church was the night of the nation. With the emancipation of the Church from the Roman yoke came the morning of England. The same hopeful dawn flamed along the continent of

Europe. It was the age of the revival of letters. Learning was no longer confined to the clergy and the cloister. The people awoke; civil and religious liberty was established. Protestantism was the herald of progress. Great names arose in England to shed lustre on her literature, or to lead her enterprise. And under the ægis of the Reformed Church, grew and widened that religious faith and civil freedom which give to nations stability and grandeur.

But remember—

> "When nations are to perish in their sins,
> 'Tis in the Church the leprosy begins."

One evening in the spring of last year, having just been released from duress by the commandant of the Carlist forces in Vera, I was making my way across the Spanish frontier by a pass in the Pyrenees, and having reached a bold spur of that magnificent mountain chain, weary, alone, with many thoughts, I turned to look from that commanding height over the lovely Spanish valleys. The lengthening shadows stretched along, and dimmed with evening the landscapes of Navarre, and I heard . . . .

> "a wind of memory murmuring the past—"

of Spain, when she was one of the morning lands of the world; her generous soil a land of corn, and wine, and oil; her mines a treasury of mineral wealth; her cities opulent and populous; her people prosperous and proud, distinguished in arts, active in manufactures, invincible in arms, on land and sea, and renowned for chivalry—Spain was first of European states—now "none so poor to do her reverence." Her throne con-

tested, her exchequer impoverished, her harbours without a navy, her armies occupied in civil war, her lands uncultivated, her art asleep, her manufactures forgotten, her cities, in many cases, half in ruin, and desolate as cities of the dead: and amid the gathering gloom of that evening, looking down from the Pyrenees, on scenes in which Nature is so bountiful, and a people so blighted, I asked myself, whence this downfall and decay? Nature has not withdrawn those endowments on which Spain's earlier glories grew. She has yet her noble seaboard on the west, washed by the waves of the Atlantic, whilst the blue Mediterranean dallies with her southern shores; the Pyrenees still guard her northern frontier; her sky is as bright, her climate as genial, her soil as generous as of yore; but over her people has darkened the shadow of that Roman superstition which is the death of nations.*

The purposes of heaven may be generous, but Rome saps the manhood of any people. Where she has sway

* Let a distinguished historian bear witness. Lord Macaulay, as the result of his wide research, testifies concerning the Roman Church: "During the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor; whilst Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails." See the whole of this very significant passage. "History of England," Vol. I. cap. i. p. 47. *Vide* also Froude's "Short Studies," Second Series.

the arts degenerate, enterprise flags, commerce withers, religion becomes a priestcraft, and freedom dies. Therefore, by the love and duty that we owe to England, let us unite to guard with watchful and resolute care the Reformed purity of the ancient National Church; for, upon this issue, now desperately raised among us, depend greatly the faith and freedom of our children, and the future of our country.

APPENDIX A.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON ON "OUR PRESENT DIFFICULTIES."—AN APPEAL TO "HIGH" CHURCHMEN.

"THE peculiarity of our day is the development of a party *within* the Church—not numerous, but zealous, active, and bold—who, having assented solemnly to the Articles and Book of Common Prayer, and asserted their belief that the doctrine of the Church of England, as therein set forth, is agreeable to the Word of God, avow it their wish and purpose to undo the work of the Reformation, attack or explain away the anti-Roman positions of the Articles of which they confess their dislike, and depreciate the Prayer Book in comparison with Roman or pre-Reformation service books, from which they supplement, not their private only, but their public devotions. In their teaching almost every doctrine and practice is reproduced which at the Reformation was renounced and laid aside. The sufficiency of Holy Scripture—the assertion of which is sometimes termed Bibliolatry—is contrasted unfavourably with the authority of the Church. Seven Sacraments are again taught; prayers for the dead, not without reference to Purgatory, practised and supplied; the invocation of the Virgin and of the Saints recommended and introduced both in hymns and manuals of

devotion; a doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist maintained, which but verbally, *if* verbally, differs from Transubstantiation; and Auricular Confession explained in accordance with the definitions of Trent, and enforced as essential to peace and pardon on all who would live holily and die happily. No wonder that Roman Catholic divines have asserted what some leaders of this so-called 'Catholic movement' have indeed themselves admitted, that they are doing in the Church of England the work of the Church of Rome. This revolutionary party has, of course, adopted—in most cases it has introduced—changes in ritual or ornament unknown or obsolete in our Church, but conformed to pre-Reformation or to modern Roman usage; which, however, have—some of them at least—been taken up by others from æsthetic motives, from love of novelty, from a desire to make the services of their Church attractive, and sometimes from a sympathy, more or less consciously felt, for some one or another of the doctrines with which the ritual practices are supposed to be connected. The result is, not unnaturally, that every change from the ordinary ritual of any Church, even when it is only towards greater order and decency, has become liable to suspicion. The shadow of the Romanizing movement falls on it. It *may* be a first step, to be followed by others, away from the principles of the Reformation. And thus many an alteration, innocent in itself, and perhaps desirable, has filled a parish with alarm, and irritated a congregation against clergymen as loyal to the Church of England as the complainants themselves. It would have been a happy thing for the peace of the Church, if at such a juncture that great school of theological thought—which is represented rather by the writings of Andrewes, Laud, and Cosin, than by those of Jewel, Hooker, Hall, and Leighton—had marked themselves off distinctly from the innovating and Romanizing party to which, if true to their own principles,

they in no wise belong. The disciples of men who wrote the 'Tortura Torbi,' the 'Conference with Fisher,' and the 'History of Transubstantiation' can have no peace with Rome. Unfortunately it was not so."—*A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of London*, 1875, *by* JOHN JACKSON D.D., *Bishop of London*, pp. 60-63. (Skeffington.)

APPENDIX B.

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL ON THE ULTIMATE AIMS OF RITUALISM.

"RITUALISM was probably at first only sensational and æsthetic. . . . The desire now is plainly to reverse them [the principles of the Reformation]. What is, or rather has been, called the Ritualistic movement has now passed into a distinctly counter-Reformation movement, and will, whenever sufficiently sustained by numbers and perfected in organization, reveal its ultimate aims with clearness and precision."—*Quoted in "Our Bishops and Deans,"* vol. i. pp. 35—37.

APPENDIX C.

LORD COLERIDGE, earnest-minded and distinguished Churchman as he is, urges the following warning—"What is the hidden principle that makes this danger so formidable to the individual as well as to the Church at large? I answer at once and unhesitatingly, the desire of power over souls and spirits of men. This principle that has wrought so much woe in this world, that has showed itself so often, and in so many and startling manifestations—this principle, against which the Church of England successfully protested at the time of the Reformation, is now returned, and is showing itself in varied forms, all preparatory and precursive to some fuller development. This is the essence of the danger we are now contemplating, and this it is that alone will account for the baffling phenomena to which I have already alluded. Many a man into whose soul this subtle form of temptation has silently entered will undertake any amount of personal labour, will manifest almost any and every form of self-denial, if only at length power over souls may be secured and recognized. What matter a hard life, days of toil and nights of watching, if acknowledged power over the souls of others can at last be grasped, and the pale and worn minister can be verily regarded as the very closer and opener of the doors of heaven—the medium between the soul and its Saviour, the bringer-down of his very Lord upon the table

before which he is standing, and the holder of the soul-secrets of the majority of those grouped around him! As Sir William Harcourt says, the Ritualist clergy tell a man that he has his God in his hand and his wife at his feet. Before such dread spiritual temptations and such unperceived but really motive springs of action, all mere outward details seem to fade away into insignificance."—*Quoted in "Our Bishops and Deans."*

APPENDIX D.

A NONCONFORMIST MINISTER'S ESTIMATE OF THE NATIONAL VALUE OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

THE following letter from the Rev. Henry Green, the Unitarian minister of Knutsford, Cheshire, was sent to the Secretary of the Liberation Society at Manchester, in reply to an invitation to attend a conference on the question of the disestablishment of the Church of England in that city:—

"To the Committee of the Manchester Branch of the Liberation Society.

"GENTLEMEN,—Your note, received only this morning, inviting me to a conference of the Liberation Society in the Town Hall, Manchester, gives me the opportunity of thanking you for your courtesy, and also of saying that the observation and thought of above forty years as a Dissenting minister convince me that the success of your society would be detrimental to the moral and social welfare of the English people. I have been led to differ widely from the Established Church in doctrines, but I am one with it in maintaining the great benefits of the parochial system, and in the desirableness, on public grounds, of maintaining the Episcopal form of Church government. Of religious liberty I possess almost as much

as I need. I stand under the old sycamore tree near my old chapel, and never tremble that any man should make me afraid. I have freedom to follow out all my duties as a minister—I can christen, marry, bury, administer the Sacrament, pray in any form of words I choose, and preach whatever I believe to be true; I can do all these things without fine, penalty, or imprisonment; and, as far as I can judge, I am not in any sense a slave that I should seek liberation. I am in my thought and in my conscience free, and daily do I bless God for the noble privilege; and because I am myself thus free, I do not aim at invading my neighbours, or at appropriating to any other than religious and charitable uses the revenues and rights of my brethren of the Established Church of England.

"I am, Gentlemen, faithfully yours,

"HENRY GREEN."

Quoted in the "Standard," April 12, 1872.

APPENDIX E.

RITUALISM, A PERIL TO THE ENGLISH CHURCH AS A NATIONAL ESTABLISHMENT.

THE Duke of Argyll, forecasting the future from a Liberal statesman's point of view, has said :—"I cannot help believing that if it should ever come into the minds of the great majority of the people of this country that the Church of England is no longer to uphold the Reformation and the victories of the Reformation, that her clergy are to revert to the whole body of theology of the Roman Catholic Church, except, perhaps, the mere supremacy of the Pope, the days of that Church as an Establishment will be numbered."

The Bishop of Bath and Wells, in an address at the Diocesan Conference, Wells, October, 1875, said :—"It must not be forgotten that there are limits, clearly-defined limits, to this freedom of thought and action in the Church. In politics the limit is loyalty to the Crown: men must keep within the lines of the British Constitution. In religion the limit is loyalty to the Reformed Church of England as established by civil and ecclesiastical law; Churchmen must keep within the lines of the letter and spirit of the Anglican Church. A movement to subject the British Empire to France or America would be treason on the part of a British subject. A movement to subject the English Church to the Bishop of Rome would be treason on the part of an English

Churchman. . . . But if, which God forbid, any considerable number of the clergy shall prove disloyal—if it shall become evident that they have ulterior objects, that they are seeking to efface the doctrines of the Reformation, and the existing complexion of the Anglican Church, and to substitute extravagant doctrines and practices for the Scriptural sobriety of the Church's authorized Ritual; and if, as the inevitable consequence of such disloyal attempts, splits and rents, and schisms, and threatening settlements, shall show themselves within the walls of the Church itself, and the hostility of Dissenting communions shall be stimulated and justified; then I believe the Church's days are numbered."

APPENDIX F.

SIGNS OF THE ACTIVE GENEROSITY OF THE NATIONAL CHURCH DURING THE LAST THIRTY-FIVE YEARS: A REPLY TO LIBERATIONISTS.

"THE Parliamentary Return recently issued, ordered on motion made by Lord Hampton in 1874, showing the expenditure since 1840 (wherever the amount exceeded £500) in building or restoring churches in England, presents a very remarkable record of the religious zeal and liberality of the generation. At the head of the several dioceses stands London, the expenditure in that diocese having reached £2,770,816, constituted as follows:—On the restoration of St. Paul's Cathedral, £62,203 between 1840 and the end of 1874, and £2,205,420 expended in building and £503,193 in restoring other churches in the diocese. Next stands the diocese of Winchester, where the expenditure is stated at £2,042,873. It exceeds a million and a-half in one other diocese—namely, Manchester, the amount being £1,513,446. There are seven other dioceses in which the amount exceeds a million; it is £1,413,924 in Rochester, £1,305,357 in Oxford, £1,291,335 in York, £1,219,330 in Chester, £1,177,584 in Lichfield, £1,126,400 in Worcester, and £1,024,622 in Ripon, this last sum including an estimate as to present expenditure on unfinished works. The amount is

£972,643 in Lincoln, £921,925 in Salisbury, £917,399 in Canterbury, £884,941 in Ely, £782,305 in Exeter, £748,388 in Chichester, £728,350 in Bath and Wells, £687,109 in Durham, £666,338 in Norwich, £443,641 in Hereford, £408,371 in St. Asaph, £391,498 in Carlisle, £374,453 in St. David's, £368,482 in Llandaff, £161,312 in Bangor, and £26,220 in Sodor and Man. Two dioceses, Peterborough and Gloucester and Bristol, are not included in the return: it may be taken that they would raise the total to £26,000,000. The expenditures of less than £500 might very likely add £2,000,000 to that amount. Many of the returns are below the real expenditure, which often cannot now be ascertained. Only a very small proportion of the amount seems to have been raised by church-rates:—In the diocese of Canterbury, £22,686; in Ely, £43,219; in Exeter, £32,702; in Lichfield, £11,282; in Durham, £4,735; in Norwich, £103,962 from rates on parish estates; in several dioceses the item is not clearly distinguished. In the return for the diocese of Oxford it is mentioned that there has been, besides the amount above stated, £548,616 expended upon 363 parsonages in the diocese within the period to which the return relates. The return does not include endowment funds created."

The *Times*, which gives the above summary, says in a leading article (Feb. 18, 1876):—

"It must require a good deal of resolution, as well as of confidence in the ultimate success of their cause, for gentlemen to expend their energies at the present moment in flogging the fatigued horse of Disestablishment . . . . To those who prefer realities to theories we recommend a short paragraph we publish this morning, which contains the substance of a Return recently printed on the motion of

Lord Hampton. It exhibits the number of Churches, including Cathedrals, in every Diocese in England, except those of Peterborough and Gloucester and Bristol, which have been built or restored at a cost exceeding £500 since the year 1840. It is not complete, owing not merely to a lack of returns from the two dioceses just mentioned, but to the impossibility of estimating all the details of expenditure. The sums under £500, which are intentionally omitted, would alone amount to a considerable sum. But, with these imperfections, the Return exhibits a total expended on churches within the last thirty-five years of no less than twenty-six millions. That amount of money, at all events, has been actually invested in the Establishment by the present generation, and it suggests a formidable idea of the compensation which might be claimed as a matter of the barest justice in the event of Disestablishment. But the Return suggests a still more interesting view of the case. What is even more remarkable than the total amount of the sum thus expended is its universal diffusion. The Return consists of about 100 pages, closely printed, of lists of Parish and District Churches, and it exhibits this liberality as spreading into every nook and corner of the country. Everywhere there has been found the means of supplying both the necessities and the adornments of religious worship and religious instruction; and from this point of view the Return obviously suggests far more than it reveals. For every hundred pounds that has been spent in mere church building, far more, beyond question, has been spent on the actual ministrations of religion and on all the educational and moral influences which are bound up with it. This is not, in short, the balance-sheet of a sect; it is the budget of a great national institution, which has everywhere been eliciting money, influence, and devotion in the cause of religion, morality,

and education. Now, what the country will want to know before it listens seriously to any arguments for Disestablishment is why it should disturb all this useful work and set the whole country in a ferment merely to satisfy theoretical views of the best form of the relations between Church and State . . . . That which the country sees is the broad fact, to which this Return bears conclusive testimony, of the vast capacity of the Church, in its present condition, for bringing religious and moral forces to bear upon every parish and hamlet in the kingdom; and it will be very slow to sacrifice an institution with this capacity in deference to a vague cry for 'religious equality.'"*

The *Pall Mall Gazette* (Feb. 18, 1876), referring to the Disestablishment agitation in the light of the above returns, says:—"It is perhaps unreasonable to expect the agitators in favour of Disestablishment to approach the question from its practical aspect, or, after having expended the required amount of oratory in showing that their object is a high and holy one, to descend to the inquiry how it is to be carried out, and what in particular are the difficulties, political and financial, of the task which they have set themselves. Now, if the facts of the matter prove anything, they prove that public opinion, which is alone 'equal to the task' of Dis-

* In the same able article the *Times* very suggestively points out the incorrect use of the phrase "religious equality" as imported into Liberationist speeches in the present day. "That phrase, indeed, we may observe, can only be inaccurately applied to this question. What religious equality has hitherto meant, and the sense in which it has been hitherto asserted by the Liberal party, is the equality of men of all religions for civil functions. It has nothing to do with a demand for the equality of all sects and communities for the discharge of religious functions."

establishment, shows not the slightest inclination to accept it, but, on the contrary, is moved by what is to all appearance a strong inclination the other way. It is from this point of view in particular that the advocates of Disestablishment would do well to study the return of which the *Times* prints the substance this morning, though it has also, of course, a purely financial significance of no less moment. Limited as it is, the return exhibits a total sum expended on churches within the last thirty-five years of over twenty-four millions. It is computed at least that the returns from two omitted dioceses will raise it to twenty-six millions. Nor is this total the result, as might be suggested, of extraordinary efforts, confined to exceptionally rich districts of the country. The universal diffusion of the liberality to which this return testifies is no less remarkable than its magnitude. The document consists of about a hundred pages, closely printed, of lists of parish and district churches, and it exhibits this liberality as spreading into every nook and corner of the country. In short, as the *Times* truly says, 'it is not the balance-sheet of a sect, it is the budget of a great national institution.' The first thing which strikes us in such a return as this is, of course, its financial bearing on the projects of the Liberation Society. Their latest, and, we believe, their most approved scheme proposes to respect Church endowments of the last forty or fifty years; it being doubtless supposed that these would form a comparatively unimportant proportion of the whole. Lord Hampton's return will show them how far astray they have been in their calculations. . . . What, in short, becomes of the argument that the Church of England is unpopular with the bulk of the people; that it is a dead and effete institution, only to be brought to life again by being separated from the State and deprived of its endowments? Since when have people taken to subscribing in every nook and corner of the country to the support of

unpopular institutions, or thought that £26,000,000 in the course of a generation was not too much to pay for the decoration of a corpse? The truth is—and not only this return but a host of other evidences proves it for those who are not blinded by sectarian animosities—that all the talk about the dislike of the people for the Church of England and their resentment of its privileges as an Establishment is merely the fictitious stock-in-trade of agitation."

APPENDIX G.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE AND THE *LITERARY CHURCHMAN* ON "THE LEAKAGE TOWARDS ROME."

In the January number of the *Church Quarterly*, Mr. Beresford Hope, never very timid in his statements, ventures to say that "the days of dangerous, as contrasted with vexatious, secessions to Rome are passed." This question of secession cannot be so slightly puffed aside. The *Weekly Register* speaks of 2,000 perversions during one year, and of "a continuous stream of converts from every Ritualistic church in London." Monsignor Capel says that the Ultra-Ritualist party are sending people "by scores, by hundreds," into the Roman Church; and elsewhere he says, "An ever-increasing current has set in from the Ritualistic party to the Catholic Church." (See *supra*, pp. 69—71.) In what sense, then, does Mr. Beresford Hope mean that secessions are now only "vexatious" and not "dangerous"? It is true he endeavours to disparage the importance of recent secessions by saying, "Impulsive women, and souls which hug tyranny rather than face responsibility, find a congenial home in the haven of personal infallibility." The statement is not flattering. Perhaps we might have expected from a champion of the Ritualist cause somewhat more generosity in

describing types of character to which Ritualism owes so many obligations. But surely it is on behalf of its weaker members that the Church should exercise tender care and special precautions. Strong and self-reliant men, like Mr. Beresford Hope, may be in no danger of seeking rest in the haven of anybody else's infallibility; but is it safe, is it just, that within the pale of the Reformed Anglican Church there should be found a busy clerical party stimulating "impulsive women" and leading "unstable souls" through the confessional to the brink of the Roman obedience? And when they slip over into the imaginary haven of personal infallibility, are we to be soothed and silenced by the apology that the secessions are "not dangerous," they are only "vexatious"?

Mr. Beresford Hope writes as a politician only, and he misses one important element in this grave question of secession. These secessions may be no danger to the Church; are they no danger to the spiritual life of the seceders?

The *Literary Churchman* (January, 1876) thinks "there has never been a time, when Church principles have been in debate, when there was so small a leakage towards Rome." The *Literary Churchman* is misinformed; but if it was true that this "continuous stream" represents the "smallest leakage," then, evidently, the vessel of the Church must be in great need of careful repair. All leakages have a self-widening tendency.

> "'It is the little rift within the lute,
> That by and by will make the music mute,
> And ever widening, slowly silence all.
> * * * *
> Or little pitted speck in garnered fruit,
> That, rotting inward, slowly moulders all.'"

APPENDIX H.

THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER ON THE HISTORIC CONTINUITY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

"THE English was a true *Reformation.* Some may think it defective and others excessive; but it was not secession, it was not destruction, it was not revolution—it was reform. It took a long time to effect. Its work went through many reigns, beginning with Henry VIII. and certainly not perfected till Charles II. It retained all fundamental doctrines, it respected all ancient formularies, it changed no ancient constitution. It had the same creed, the same clergy, even the same service—translated and purged, but not abolished—the same Church courts, the same Church laws. There was but one thing which it absolutely swept away, viz., the usurped supremacy of the Pope, and its natural consequences."*

"It is certain that no English ruler, no English Parliament, thought of setting up a new Church, but simply of reforming the existing English Church. Nothing was further from the mind of either Henry VIII. or of Elizabeth than the thought that either of them was doing anything new. Neither of them ever thought for a moment of establishing a new

* "Pastoral Letter," 1875, p. 8.

Church, or of establishing anything at all. In their own eyes they were not establishing but reforming; they were neither pulling down nor setting up, but simply putting to rights. . . . There was no one act called the Reformation; the Reformation was the gradual result of a long series of acts. There was no one moment, no one Act of Parliament, when and by which a church was 'established;' still less was there any act by which one Church was 'disestablished' and another Church 'established' in its place!"—*Disestablishment and Disendowment*, by E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D.—a learned and interesting pamphlet.

APPENDIX I.

ROMAN AND RITUALIST DOCTRINE OF "INTENTION."

"*Intention* in the celebration of sacraments is considered by Roman theologians to be necessary for their validity. Thus the Council of Trent [Sess. vii., Can. 11] decrees: 'If any one shall say, that in ministers, whilst they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does; let him be Anathema.' The same principle was enunciated in the Constitution of Martin V. and Eugenius IV. in the early part of the preceding century."*

Dean Hook says truly (Ch. Dicty. *in loco*), "This is a monstrous and fearful assertion, which supposes it to be in the power of every malicious or sceptical priest to deprive the holiest of GOD'S worshippers of the grace of the sacraments. . . . But the Church of Rome is not content with placing all receivers of sacraments at the mercy of the priest's intention; . . . but in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist she has placed the communicants at the mercy of the baker's and vintner's intention, and any tradesman who supplies the wine and wafers to be used in the Lord's Supper has it in his power, according to their rubrics, to deprive the

* "Dictionary of Doct. and Hist. Theol." (Blunt) *in loco*.

communicants of the grace of the sacrament. For 'Si panis non sit triticeus, vel si triticeus, admixtus sit granis alterius generis in tanta quantitate, ut non maneat panis triticeus, vel sit alioqui corruptus: non conficitur sacramentum.'" Further quotations to the same effect are given by the Dean from the *Rubricæ Generales Mess. Rom.*

The 26th Article of our Anglican Church has this pernicious error in view, or at least effectually condemns it; as the Bishop of Winchester says in his valuable treatise [*Expos.* xxxix *Arts. in loco*]: "It is not because ministers will, or intend to bestow grace, but because Christ has ordained to give grace through their ministry. If, then, they rightly administer, and we rightly receive, the ordinance, we need not consider what is the mind of the priest, since it is not in the power of man's intention to frustrate the gracious purposes of God. Were it otherwise, no Church could be sure of its orders, no Christian of his baptism."

But we find an ultra-Ritualist organ, the *Church Review*, June 19, 1875, stating: "Western theology teaches that the celebrant only consecrates such of the bread and wine as he intends. Common sense and reason will endorse this decision." And another correspondent says, in the same paper, that whether all the bread and wine that may be upon the altar be consecrated at the time of consecration "depends entirely on the *intention* of the priest, though to prevent any doubt that might arise in regard to the bread, he is recommended to *intend* to consecrate *all* that is on the paten or corporal, lest if he thought of a certain number, and there was afterwards found to be more, it might be uncertain which was consecrated and which was not; or if he intended to consecrate what he saw and afterwards found there was more lying out of sight, there might be also uncertainty."

Thus works this leaven of most injurious error; and the danger grows. If that system of ultra-Ritualist thought

and practice which is unfolded in the preceding pages were true and prevalent, then would not only be realized the terrible words of Sir William Harcourt, quoted by Lord Coleridge—"the Ritualist clergy tell a man that he has his God in his hand and his wife at his feet," but every infant at the baptismal font, and every communicant at the Eucharistic feast, would be at the mercy of the ministering priest's *intention*. Thus the "new and living way which He hath consecrated for us" (Heb. x. 20), would be liable to be impeded by an invisible and unknown barrier; and between the soul and its ever merciful Saviour might be interposed the incalculable quantity of a preventive human will.

PARDON AND SON, PRINTERS, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.